Troubling Cosmopolitanism

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Joanne Kalogeras

Gender Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, August 2014

Declaration

I certify that the thesis I have presented for examination for the MPhil/PhD degree of the London School of Economics and Political Science is solely my own work other than where I have clearly indicated that it is the work of others (in which case the extent of any work carried out jointly by me and any other person is clearly identified in it).

I warrant that this authorisation does not, to the best of my belief, infringe the rights of any third party.

I declare that my thesis consists of 76,771 words.

Abstract

This thesis proposes a reconstructed, critical cosmopolitanism that uses the identified core components of the normative branch of cosmopolitanism rooted in (Kantian) moral philosophy and the works of a wide variety of critical theorists that include feminist, postcolonial, and queer perspectives. I pay particular attention to those theorists influenced by poststructuralist deconstructions of the stable subject who focus either on the normative theory directly or on components essential to it. Normative theorists, exemplified by Thomas Pogge, Simon Caney and others, usually focus on global distributive justice, taking as a given, for example, who counts as human. Critical theorists, such as Judith Butler, question that premise. This postmodern turn has implications for what I argue are the three necessary components of cosmopolitanism: autonomy, universality, and its anti-nationalist position. However, the first two have been problematised because of their liberal conceptualisations, which then has implications for cosmopolitanism's anti-nationalist position as well. I propose a reconfiguration of cosmopolitanism that retains the core normative concepts, but rejects their more liberal interpretations. I argue that the atomistic individual as the basis for liberal autonomy is flawed, and that liberal cosmopolitan conceptualisations of univeralism do not recognise its particularity. I also argue that that the normative theory does not fully take into account nationalism's dependence on the marginalisations of non-normative populations within the nation state, and how those dependencies might be complicit with nationalism's othering of those across borders. In addition to a number of normative theorists, the thesis references such multidisciplinary thinkers as Butler, Linda Zerilli and Hannah Arendt. I examine the works of different theorists to develop a reformulation of each of these concepts and integrate an intersubjective approach into these reformulations in order to assemble a feminist, intersubjective, critical cosmopolitan theory. I suggest the adoption of a 'cosmopolitan intersubjectivity' in order to show how these concepts can be reconfigured to work together more cohesively and give cosmopolitan theory greater internal consistency.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude first to Anne Phillips and Clare Hemmings. Their erudition, supervisory expertise, patience and good humour have made what I thought at times was insurmountable, possible. It has been a true privilege and honour to work with them. I would also like to thank our department manager Hazel Johnstone for making everything easier.

My friends and colleagues at LSE's Gender Institute and Government and Sociology departments have provided me with personal and scholarly support: Amy Hinterberger, Marina Franchi, Carolyn Pedwell, Gwen Beetham, Sadie Wearing, Natasha Marhia, Chinwe Madubuike, Carolyn Williams, Faith Armitage, Christina Scharff, Patrizia Kokot, Amanda Conroy, Alex Leveringhaus, Diane Chilangwa Farmer, Deborah Finding, Suki Ali, Kimberly Hutchings, Astrida Neimanis, Josephine Wilson, Sumi Madhok, Tracey Jensen, Rebecca Lawrence, Monica Wirz, and Muriel Kahane.

Natasha, Amy, Alex, Amanda, Marina, and Faith were tireless discussants and readers. Their encouragements made a substantial difference to this thesis. Patrizia's proofing and Marina's bibliography checking in the final stages were invaluable. Robert Kulpa was a brilliant resource on nationalism and sexuality, and he continues to be inspiring as a fellow activist. Joel Blum has been a wonderful friend, grammarian and proofreader even when he had no idea what I was talking about. I remain indebted to him for his gracious hospitality.

Thanks especially to my friends Diane Monteil, Valerie Leopold, Roshni Rustomji Kerns, Sarah Waters, Peter Kelsch, Jeff Pittelkau, Elizabeth Zitrin, Stephanie Bird, and the Misfit Toys for always being there. Love and gratitude to my mother, Elaine Kalogeras, and to my sister, Georgene Kalogeras Reschke, for supporting me in special ways, both materially and emotionally.

This thesis was partially funded by the LSE's Gender Institute and the Coca Cola Foundation. Without this generous support and the help of Rose Harris, Sean McNally, Ali Weyli, Sue Haines, Nicola Martin, and Dr Rom Naidoo I would not have been able to complete it.

Lastly, I would like to thank my father, Peter Kalogeras, for a lifetime of believing in me. He was the cosmopolitan I aspire to be. He instilled his unique brand of ethical idealism and his wonderment at the world in me, for which I am eternally grateful. This thesis is dedicated to his memory.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Troubling Cosmopolitanism

> The peoples of the earth have thus entered in varying degrees into a universal community, and it has developed to the point where a violation of rights in *one* part of the world is felt *everywhere*. The idea of a cosmopolitan right is therefore not fantastic and overstrained; it is a necessary complement to the unwritten code of political and international right, transforming it into a universal right of humanity. Only under this condition can we flatter ourselves towards a perpetual peace. (Kant [1795] 1977a: 107-108)

Cosmopolitanism is what Kant had in mind as a solution to what he saw as the global problem of human rights violations. More than two hundred years later, the emergence of rapid technological advances in communications has meant that the transmission of information over time and space has been condensed; thus, Kant's claim that 'a violation of rights in *one* part of the world is felt *everywhere*' means something even more immediate today than it might have two centuries ago. Kant is concerned with two different issues in the above claim: human rights violations and war (through his stated goal of a 'perpetual peace'). His assertion is that a cosmopolitan right addresses both these problems because he saw war, human rights violations, and the notion of absolute national sovereignty as related, all transgressions of 'a universal right of humanity'. Contemporary cosmopolitans also hold this view and see these issues, along with poverty and the unequal distribution of global wealth and resources, as related social injustices.

In this thesis I look at the promise of cosmopolitanism. Specifically, I critically examine how it may offer a viable and perhaps necessary path towards peace and social justice. For normative cosmopolitan theorists, this begins by expanding the domain of principles of justice to the global realm. In the most general terms, the '*cosmopolitan ideal*' is '[a] world in which some fundamental principles of justice govern relations between all persons in all places' (McKinnon 2005: 235). This entails a 'cosmopolitan requirement', common to all versions of cosmopolitanism, where 'any commitment to some fundamental principles of justice at the domestic level ought to be extended so as to generate principles of justice with cosmopolitan scope' (McKinnon 2005: 235-236). The normative premise is that all people have equal moral worth, and because of that univeralism we all have the same moral obligations to everyone regardless of geography, nationality, identity, political affiliation, or any other trait or status (Kleingeld and Brown 2009). Those obligations and corresponding rights mean universal principles of justice apply to everyone, and this egalitarian, anti-nationalist, human-rights

centred philosophy aims to correct the imbalance of global wealth that normative cosmopolitans see as the primary cause of poverty and war.

The basic cosmopolitan notion is that principles of justice are global and are not restricted to the nation state domain; despite that premise, cosmopolitanism remains one of the more underspecified political theories. Moreover, cosmopolitanism has come under critique by a range of critical theorists that encompass queer, feminist, and postcolonial theories. Normative cosmopolitan theorist Thomas Pogge has proposed three basic tenets that most normative theorists subscribe to as definitive and essential to contemporary cosmopolitan theory:

> First, *individualism*: the ultimate units of concern are *human beings*, or *persons*—rather than, say, family lines, tribes, ethnic, cultural, or religious communities, nations, or states. The latter may be units of concern only indirectly, in virtue of their individual members or citizens. Second, *universality*: the status of ultimate unit of concern attaches to every living human being equally—not merely to some subset, such as men, aristocrats, Aryans, whites, or Muslims. Third, *generality*: this special status has global force. Persons are ultimate units of concern —not only for their compatriots, fellow religionists, or suchlike. (Pogge 2002: 169)

Pogge's descriptive account of cosmopolitanism is accepted by most normative cosmopolitan theorists (Caney 2001: 976-977). It prompts the two questions that this thesis examines. First, what are the basic theoretical concepts that constitute a form of cosmopolitanism responsive to the concerns of critical theorists? In answering this question I draw on Pogge's three basic tenets, autonomy, univeralism, and anti-nationalism to argue that these three components that describe normative cosmopolitanism remain vital to a critical cosmopolitanism. However, while these concepts are frequently the focus of normative cosmopolitan theorists, the liberal roots and interpretations applied to these concepts make them difficult to resuscitate for a critical cosmopolitan theory. The second question, then, is whether or not these concepts are recuperable as components for a viable critical cosmopolitanism. In answering this question, I make the argument that critical theory has provided reconceptualisations of autonomy and universalism which are more compatible with cosmopolitanism's basic premise that principles of justice are global than the liberal versions, and that the deconstruction of nationalism exposes its intranational foundations, thus providing a stronger basis for cosmopolitanism's anti-nationalist position.

Therefore, this thesis consists of two central arguments. One is that the normative assumption that the concepts of autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism are key to cosmopolitan theory is correct, that some versions of each of these three components are what constitute

contemporary cosmopolitan theory. In each substantive chapter on these concepts, I explain why the concept is essential to cosmopolitanism. The second argument is that each concept must be reconstructed by challenging the liberal constraints that define normative cosmopolitanism. Each corresponding chapter concludes with a version that I suggest is most compatible to a cosmopolitanism that rejects dichotomous conceptualisations, which, I argue, are not conducive to the basic cosmopolitan notions of global justice.

In this project's conclusion, I outline a reconstructed cosmopolitanism that incorporates these reconceptualisations and incorporates an intersubjective account of the individual instead of normative cosmopolitanism's Western-influenced individualism, a position that affects all three components. In doing so, I construct a critical, socially transformative, transdisciplinary cosmopolitan theory that may be more relevant now than ever as we search for ways to survive, get along, and even flourish with each other.

Pogge's three tenets correspond to the three crucial components that constitute cosmopolitanism in the following ways. His *individualism* describes agentic autonomy, a requirement for self-determination and the crucial right to exit a group or nation state for those who are suffering from persecution (see Kant's cosmopolitan right below). Pogge's *universality* refers to the universalisms on which cosmopolitan human rights and obligations are based, meaning these rights and obligations that stem from principles of justice apply to everyone everywhere, and without which cosmopolitanism would not be global in scope, such that the global force of his *generality* is a direct challenge to nationalism and (absolute) national sovereignty. The inference here is that the principles of justice apply to all individuals regardless of the nation state they may be part of, which challenges the notion contained in absolute sovereignty that no other entity outside of the nation state can override decisions that nation makes pertaining to its inhabitants. Critical theorists do not often discuss cosmopolitanism or the three components I put forth as key here in terms of 'principles of justice', though they do argue in terms of social justices and injustices. Whilst normative theorists like Pogge envision the cornerstones of cosmopolitan theory as those three components, critical theorists do not appear to see all three concepts as key and interrelated, which I argue makes for a coherent cosmopolitan theory. Further, I suggest that reconceptualisations of these key concepts are necessary for a viable, reconstructed critical cosmopolitanism.

Martha Nussbaum's 1994 essay, 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism' and the twenty-nine replies published with it in *Boston Review* helped to spark a renewed interest in cosmopolitanism, as it

coincided with a focus on globalisation and its attendant political discourse.[1] Whilst the international urgencies of today—wars that involve coterminous and distant countries, genocides, torture, terrorism, water shortages affecting neighbouring countries, global environmental disasters, the economic effects of accelerating globalisation—are not entirely new, the current attention to cosmopolitanism in the West is at least in part due to a convergence of these events in the last few decades.

More recently debates on cosmopolitanism have extended to other disciplines as well. Two results of the phenomenal growth of information technology are high-speed communications and the advent of the Web, which have translated into easier and faster access to information for a greater number of people. In addition, an increasingly globalised market has accelerated economic knock-on effects exponentially. These two trends are related: the evolution of global markets has most recently been driven by high technology (faster responses in larger markets), but the effects are not all economic. The coincident political environment that has been both a cause and a consequence of globalisation includes the downfall of communist-led Eastern-bloc governments, the opening of previously closed markets such as China, an apparent loss of faith in socialism at governmental and grass roots levels in many northern/western countries, and the spread of so-called neoliberal political and economic policies put forth in the 1980s by the UK's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and America's President Ronald Reagan. A decade later, Labour became Tony Blair's New Labour and the Democratic Party embraced the fiscal centrism of Bill Clinton, both proponents of 'individual responsibility', privatisation, and the partial or complete dismantling of welfare systems. Yet the gap between rich and poor has only widened in the last thirty years (Beitz 1999a: 516-518; Pandya 2004; U.S. Summary 2000). Terrorism, religious fundamentalism, and war have propelled more communities into extreme violence, resulting in a rise in migrations and diasporic communities: by the end of 2013, over 50 million people worldwide had been 'forcibly displaced', the highest number since World War II (UNHRC 2014: 2). These developments have had other, more positive effects as well: the growing rates of human interaction have resulted in more obvious interdependencies, including increasing personal investments in relationships on both global and local levels. People see themselves as connected to more people than ever before in a number of ways, such as through

[1] *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism* was published in 1996, edited by Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen. It contained eleven of the original replies to the article, some substantially revised, along with five additional contributions. Nussbaum's original article was included, along with her reply to the collection of responses. This thesis references the 1996 publication.

burgeoning social media trends, where people can become 'online' friends with people they may never meet in person, or through, for instance, knowledge of how overseas factories are run by companies from which they buy consumer goods. It is unsurprising, then, that in the present political and economic climate, cosmopolitanism is commanding more attention from sociologists, international relations scholars, cultural geographers, and other disciplines as well as from moral and political theorists.

Cosmopolitan theory has attracted the attention of these different theorists for a number of reasons as more disciplines are turning their focus to global problems. Whilst it is an old and established political theory with strong links to moral philosophy, it is also protean and open-ended (Beitz 2005: 18). Of the major normative political theories debated today (liberal nationalism, liberal cosmopolitanism and utilitarianism/consequentialism), only moral cosmopolitanism holds an all-inclusive global 'citizenship' as its premise, which has enhanced its appeal in a contentious world. As such, many critical theorists share its generally anti-nationalist position. Key to these critical theories are social marginalisation problems that are related to nationalism and nation: sexual dissidence and heteronormativity, racism, and identity. Cosmopolitanism has attracted both normative and critical theorists who have an interest in these issues, and particularly those interested in international peace and human rights, postcoloniality, and feminism. This combination of concerns has led to critiques of cosmopolitan theory and its foundations from virtually every discipline in the social sciences. Such multidisciplinary interest presents potential for a transdisciplinary cosmopolitanism that makes possible the reformulation of what I propose are core cosmopolitan concepts: autonomy, univeralism, and anti-nationalism. This thesis thus sets out to 'trouble' cosmopolitanism upon those three conceptual axes. In doing so it brings together the long standing issues raised by Kant two centuries ago, with the concerns of contemporary critical theory in order to work towards a reconstructed cosmopolitan theory.

Normative and Critical Approaches to Cosmopolitanism

This thesis engages with normative and critical approaches to cosmopolitanism. Whilst both approaches are concerned with issues such as the economic exploitation of resources and the increased flow of capital serving the wealthiest, they offer different modes of reasoning to address these issues. Despite the recent movement towards sustainability, civilians and corporations continue to do battle over dwindling resources and mounting environmental crises in a time of escalating consumption. It is within this frame that many philosophers and social scientists are looking for ways to alleviate strife, poverty, and hunger. Cosmopolitan proposals

arise directly from the idea that the more well off have obligations to alleviate injustices by remedying inequalities: because all people have the same moral worth, all should benefit from the same universal principles of justice.

Whilst the intentions of cosmopolitan theory are commendable, many question cosmopolitan interventions as another form of liberal imperialism, with the imposition of hegemonic values and norms onto the 'other'. Autonomy has different meanings and valuations in different cultures, which I discuss in Chapter Three. If there are truly universal principles of justice, how did they come about? How do we decide what those principles are? In Chapter Four, I argue that even whilst there may be a global consensus on the equal moral worth of all people, the determination of universalisms is essentially a political process and should be recognised as such. This is in contrast to the 'discovery' of *a priori* human commonalities and rights. In that chapter I suggest that feminist discourse ethics is a useful approach to resolving conflicts in that political process. And whilst nationalism and patriotism have advantages that group cohesion sometimes provide, they are based on exclusions and marginalisations of minority populations that are antithetical to cosmopolitanism, an issue I discuss in Chapter Five.

The more traditional, normative cosmopolitan theorists subscribe firmly to the idea that because all individuals have the same moral worth, our obligations to each other do not change according to whatever personal characteristics we may have. Referencing Rabindranath Tagore's *The Home and the World*, Nussbaum argues that once one has made the 'morally questionable' move to define oneself first by a 'morally irrelevant characteristic', namely as a citizen of the nation in which one is born (which she states is morally arbitrary) instead of as a citizen of the world (which is a moral choice), one might then use any morally irrelevant characteristic (gender, religion, hair colour, etc.) to privilege any one group over another (Nussbaum 1996: 5, 12-15; 1999: 57; Tagore 1985). The choice of world citizenship over any other allegiance, according to Nussbaum, is the only morally good choice to make. The assertion has given rise to heated debates over nationalism, the meaning of individual autonomy, and universal human rights, amongst others.

As a relatively underspecified philosophy, John Tomlinson referred to cosmopolitanism as 'still largely a speculative discourse' (2002: 240). It is old, coming from the Cynics and Stoics of ancient Greece and Rome. Today it is widely considered a liberal theory with contemporary roots in Kant's moral philosophy (Cheah 2006a: 487). To normative cosmopolitans, it is about global distributive justice and human rights; to others, it is about sovereignty and a challenge to

nationalism; to others still, it is about cultural identity, or multiculturalism, and '[i]n part, the focus on justice reflects the continuing influence of John Rawls, who insisted that "[j]ustice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought"' (thereby strengthening its link to liberalism) (Scheffler 2008: 68). That influence is also a reflection of Kant's concerns about absolute national sovereignty and for global justice. Thus, normative cosmopolitan theory emphasises justice through liberal interpretations of rights and obligations; however, normative theorists are also aware that it is the enormous disparity in the wealth of nations, including the differences in access to resources, that is responsible for much of the world's strife, affecting wars, poverty, hunger, and the subjugation of women and ethnic minorities. Whilst justice is a primary concern for liberal theorists in general, normative cosmopolitan theorists are more keenly focused on the global distribution of wealth and resources as the biggest factors in social justice.

The broadening interest in cosmopolitanism has revealed problematic aspects that are often ignored or over looked by normative theory. A number of critical theorists have challenged contemporary cosmopolitanism's liberal foundations, especially those poststructuralist-influenced theorists who deconstruct its universalisms and question the idea of autonomous subjectivity (Butler and Sabsay 2010; Zerilli 1998). Some have addressed cosmopolitanism directly, but many of the problems that concern theorists with feminist, postcolonial, and queer perspectives are specifically the ones that normative debates have largely ignored or dismissed (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000a; Pollock, Bhabha et al 2000). Accordingly, normative cosmopolitan theorists' common failure to acknowledge the concerns of those who are marginalised—women, ethnic minorities, and sexual dissidents in particular—have been brought to the fore by those critical theorists.

Yet many of the critical appraisals of normative cosmopolitanism end up overlooking and dismissing what, I will argue, are valuable aspects of normative cosmopolitan theory despite the common interest in world peace, multiculturalism, and social injustices. Cosmopolitanism's egalitarian guiding principles of inclusion, equality, agency, and the valuing of difference are principles that also ground much of feminist theory, as well as queer and postcolonial theories. This project's goal is to work through the areas of conflict and different theoretical perspectives by integrating the work of feminist, postcolonial, and queer theorists, especially through deconstructions of liberal and universalist binaries and exclusions. By drawing on theorists from different disciplines and perspectives (and especially from Hannah Arendt, Judith Butler, and

Linda Zerilli) I conclude by presenting a reconstructed, critical cosmopolitan theory constituted of core components of the normative with certain critical reconceptualisations of those components. Feminist theorists have highlighted the problems of individualistic autonomy that does not take into account social context (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000a; 2000b; Butler 2000) and queer feminist theorists have identified the heteronormative foundations of gender and sex discrimination (Butler 1999). Postcolonial theorists problematise nationalist ideologies and the privileging of group identification, questioning the pros and cons of nationalism from the perspective of the colonised and subaltern (Puri 2004). These insights into internationalism, identity, and racism are currently under-represented in normative cosmopolitanism, and could benefit from the work done by postcolonial, feminist, and queer theorists on the intersection of nation building and heteronormativity. Queer theorists' destabilisation of the presumed stable relationships between sex, gender, and identity upon which nation, nationalism, and sexuality are linked is useful in challenging nationalist ideologies. However, in many of these areas hegemonic Western discourse means international perspectives and ethnicity issues are still problematic, particularly in queer and feminist theories—at times through their notable absence in many debates, and at other times through the less-than-informed treatment they sometimes do receive (Ang 2001; Spurlin 2001: 185, 199). Keeping such problems in mind, these perspectives are nevertheless useful in the effort to develop a transformative, transdisciplinary cosmopolitanism. It is in the areas where nation, identity, race, gender, and sexuality implicate each other that I intend to focus in order to develop such an integrative, critical cosmopolitanism.

Liberal foundations

The relationship between cosmopolitanism and liberalism is an important one, as is the relationship between liberalism and feminism, and both have been the topic of debates by liberal cosmopolitan theorists such as Nussbaum and Kwame Anthony Appiah (Appiah 1998; Nussbaum 1998). Because liberalism is largely responsible for the rights won by US feminists in the 19th and 20th centuries, many Western feminists have retained certain liberal principles, however cautiously. Nussbaum notes that the three main charges against liberalism are its focus on individualism, its abstract notion of equality that fails to consider situatedness, and its focus on reason at the cost of emotion and care, all of which I discuss in more depth in Chapter Three (Nussbaum 1998: 58-59). Feminist critiques have theorised all three of these topics as masculinised; thus, many, especially feminist critical theorists either voice suspicion or reject liberalism entirely. At the same time, it is liberalism's emphasis on equality that some maintain

is, in proper implementation, compatible with feminism's insistence on women's rights trumping what are often misogynist group (cultural) rights that determine women's instrumental roles in the family and community (Nussbaum 1998; Okin, Cohen et al 1999) (I discuss these complexities further in Chapters Three and Four). Thus, feminist theory has an often-contentious relationship with liberalism (Anderson, A. 1998; Braidotti 2006; Pollock 2000; Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000) These critiques of liberalism have been successful in pointing out flaws and inconsistencies in liberal philosophy and thinking, focusing on notions of equality and gender 'blindness' that perpetuate power inequities between men and women, and the problematic perception of the atomistic individual, separate from location, social, and intimate contexts (Code 1991: 76). These analyses have implications for cosmopolitan theory because they expose some of normative cosmopolitan theory's conceptual flaws due to its contemporary liberal foundations.

Yet both liberalism and cosmopolitanism retain their appeal to global justice theorists and many human rights activists because human rights still centre on the individual. Whilst injustices happen to groups and group rights remain an integral part of liberal human rights campaigns, it is individuals who are affected by them—groups, after all, consist of individuals. It is ultimately the individual who suffers from starvation, torture, persecution, and statelessness. It is the individual who may be a persecuted minority within a group. Human rights are ultimately about individuals, and those rights trump group or state rights; therefore, it is the individual who has the right to discourse with those in other cultures, and if threatened by a group or nation has the right to leave as a matter of self-preservation—this is Kant's basic cosmopolitan right (Kant [1795] 1977a: 105-106).[2]

I argue that cosmopolitan theory needs to retain some form of autonomy and the idea of the individual because of this, and most importantly, because agentic autonomy (as self-determination) is necessary for a persecuted person's right to exit a group or nation. Kant's cosmopolitan right is preserved in virtually all forms of cosmopolitanism (which I discuss more fully in Chapters Two and Three), and which is linked to cosmopolitan universalism because for cosmopolitans, this right extends to everyone everywhere.

[2] This cosmopolitan right to exit is in conjunction with Kant's argument that nations have an obligation of hospitality to those in need (Kant [1795] 1977a: 104-108). I discuss this right further in Chapter Three.

Troubling Liberalism, Troubling Cosmopolitanism

Troubling cosmopolitan theory requires engaging with the liberal principles upon which contemporary normative cosmopolitanism has developed. Liberalism's individualism and autonomy are both based on universalisms—all people are of equal moral worth and should have equal basic liberties, and no group or person has the right to infringe on any individual's universal rights and liberties. However, the model of that individual is liberalism's abstract, atomistic, transcendent man: the masculinised, stable, prediscursive subject (Braidotti 2013: 8, 15-18; Mackenzie and Stoljar: 2000b; Nedelsky 1989: 8). Whilst normative distributive justice theorists are liberal, many cultural and critical theorists are suspicious of liberalism's universalisms because they have been and continue to be used to exclude women and minorities under the guise of universalist *impartiality*. As I discuss in Chapters Three and Four, feminist and postcolonial theorists have revealed this assumed neutrality as false. Liberal cosmopolitanism is individualistic because the basic unit of moral concern is the individual; that in itself is not necessarily a problem, and I agree with normative theorist Pogge that some form of individualism is key to cosmopolitanism for the reasons I give above (1992: 48-49). It is the form, the liberal conceptualisation of the individual that has been the subject of critiques in feminist, queer, and postcolonial theories because of this false universalism. 'Everyone' has too often meant 'male' and 'white,' and the masculine norm has stood in for 'equal'. Feminist critiques in particular emphasise its elision of the support that the individual actually requires from family (i.e. women) in the separate, depoliticised private sphere, and from the individual's community (Nedelsky 1989: 9-12).

That apparent neutrality extends to the concept of the human. Distributive justice theorists' calling for an all-inclusive world citizenship rarely recognises 'humanity' as a contested category despite contemporary and historical evidence of colonialism and genocide in its name.[3] Indeed, Pogge once asserted (in a footnote) that delineating different notions of 'person' and 'human being' are not necessary in the attempt to define cosmopolitanism (1992: 48). In 2002 he revisited that assertion, conceding that the definition of humanity is contested, but his subsequent theorising did not seem to take that acknowledgment into account (2002: 94). Pogge's contention that 'persons' are the 'ultimate units of moral concern' may be a logical and

[3] Historically, 'humanity' has denoted white, heterosexual, economically advantaged men at the top of a biological hierarchy that was the basis for much of colonialism (Gilman 1992: 180, 188-189). There is a strong case to be made that 'humanity's' history is filled with such exclusions, an argument I make in Chapter Four.

precise description of how moral philosophy defines individual moral worth in social justice contexts, but it is also a reflection of the field's abstract and disembodied conceptualisations of equality and humanity, a common complaint of feminist and postcolonial theorists (Pogge 1992: 48-49; see also Chapter Three).

Social and cultural notions of universalisms are always particular because they always grow out of situatedness—in this sense, they are never 'top down', but evolve from particular circumstances and contexts, even when they have much in common with other cultures' universalisms (for example, the illegality and immorality of killing another human being: killing is illegal everywhere yet virtually all cultures make some allowances and exceptions). Hence, the essential problem with universalisms is that they are not created with the intention to adapt, but that they emerge *styled to* the culture or group from which they spring, regardless of how common the essence of a universalism might be (Butler 1995b: 130; Zerilli 2009: 303). The universalisms used in the US Constitution are different from French universalisms, which differ from the Southern African universalist, egalitarian belief system known as Ubuntu (see Chapter Four). The primary cosmopolitan universalism is that all people have the same moral worth, and therefore all people have the same rights and obligations. Exactly what those rights and obligations are has been the subject of debates, particularly in normative cosmopolitanism. However, that dependence on moral worth, which is linked to Kantian rationality (all humans are rational beings, a problematic notion I discuss in Chapter Four), presupposes that who might be human is obvious. The history of genocide indicates that this is not a given. In this project, I argue that the fact of the plurality of the world's populations—the Arendtian and Kantian notion that we all must live together on this planet because war and genocide are the alternative—serves as a better foundation for cosmopolitan universalism than liberal cosmopolitanism's moral worth and human rationality contentions (Arendt [1958] 1998: 8; Kant [1784] 1977b: 106). Plurality is especially useful to cosmopolitanism because it is the dual recognition of the fact of difference, and the fact that people must live on this earth together, despite difference. Both facts are important to most cosmopolitans (Hall 2002: 30).

Therefore, autonomy and universalism are subject to in-depth critiques because they are the basis for the conceptualisation of the individual, because the liberal definitions do not effectively account for difference and situatedness, and because these concepts have in turn implications for cosmopolitanism's anti-nationalist position. Autonomy and cosmopolitan universalism are linked through the liberal assumption that all people are autonomous in a similar way, hence

universalising it. That liberal perspective does not take into account intersubjectivity, or different subjectivities in general. This, then, has implications for the anti-nationalist position because subjectivity and identity are interrelated, and nationalism relies on nationalist identity. When identities are exposed as fluid and multi-dimensional, and when subjectivity is understood as constituted by and through others, national identity is show to be unstable (see Chapters Three and Five). As I argue in Chapter Five, national identity is based on exclusion within the nation state as well as beyond national borders, and exclusion is antithetical to cosmopolitanism's position on the principles of justice being global. I argue here that intersubjectivity and multi-dimensional identities are highly complementary to the cosmopolitan position, much more so than the liberal interpretations of the atomistic individual.

This project 'troubles' cosmopolitanism through the use of analyses by both normative and critical theorists in order to explain why autonomy, univeralism, and anti-nationalism are crucial to cosmopolitanism, and what reconceptualisations are more compatible with this critical cosmopolitanism. The regular inclusion of autonomy and universalism in normative cosmopolitan debates has garnered a great deal of attention by critical theorists that is rarely integrated in those normative debates. I will show that these liberal understandings of autonomy and universalism have significant implications for its third component, cosmopolitanism's anti-nationalist position, as noted above. In addition, some cosmopolitan theorists have attempted to reconcile various weak versions of patriotism or nationalism with this anti-nationalist stance. I will argue that national identity is based on hierarchical marginalisations that structure broader meanings of nation, resulting in heightened nationalism with harmful ramifications within the state, and suggest cosmopolitanism patriotism is contrary to its core principles.

Autonomy, universalism, and nationalism

Whilst I agree with Pogge and other normative, liberal theorists that autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism provide the foundation for cosmopolitanism, I contend that autonomy and universalism must take into account social context to be reformulated in order to address critics' charges that include elitism and hegemony. In addition to discussing these two concepts in relation to anti-nationalism, I argue that it is necessary to address the fundamental dependence of national identity on oppressive marginalisations of significant portions of any nation state's population, without which it runs the risk of perpetuating nationalism's problems of exclusion. These troubling foundations are complicit with the more obvious symptomatic problems of nationalist exclusivity between and within nations that normative theorists more readily

recognise, namely frequent hostility to ethnic groups within nation states and a strict 'us/them' perspective on those outside their borders. Normative cosmopolitan theory recognises the problem of intra-state nationalisms (such as ethnic minorities) that sometimes conflict with the encompassing nation state's nationalism. But beyond that, it is in a sense a fundamental paradox of normative cosmopolitanism that its focus is generally outward in its criticism of nationalism, despite nationalism always beginning internally through identity and exclusion. Normative cosmopolitanism relies largely on relationships between nation states for global solutions to poverty and violence (such as Pogge's Global Resource Dividend proposal, which attempts to balance resource trades between nations in different stages of development (Pogge 2001)), though its philosophical emphasis is on the individual and the relationship to the other. It is less a theory that examines what cosmopolitanism might mean between members of a society or nation state, or an individual's relationship (through identity) with themselves. Reconstructing cosmopolitanism through an intersubjective account of the individual and community reveals interdependencies and a mutuality that are complementary and based on a constituting sociality that rejects binary thinking: us/them, individual/community, nation state/other nation states. Hence my contribution here is both epistemological by interrogating how the terrain is constituted, and methodological by changing the point of entry into the field on the ideal rather than on the hierarchical constitution of those binaries upon which liberal cosmopolitanism is based. In this sense, normative theorists miss (or ignore) the processes through which their own ideals might be achieved. If there is an essence to the concept of cosmopolitanism, the atomistic individual is less cosmopolitan than the socially constituted subject. *A priori* universalisms are less cosmopolitan than political iterations of those principles of justice that remain contingent because of the fact of difference. Anti-nationalism begins by recognising internal marginalisations and exclusions of minorities that are the basis for national identities and nationalism.

I argue that the overlap between cosmopolitan and critical perspectives provides enough commonality for the development of a reformulated, reconstructed critical cosmopolitanism, one that retains the core concepts of normative moral cosmopolitanism and integrates critiques from non-normative perspectives (cosmopolitan or otherwise). This includes a more intersubjective account of autonomy that acknowledges how autonomy and agency are '*normatively coded* in social contexts' (Benhabib 2014: 699); a more particular, contingent, and politicised universalism based on the fact of plurality; a deeper analysis of the internal marginalisations on which national identity and nationalism rely; and finally, a cosmopolitanism that recognises

sociality and interdependence, rather that the absolute autonomy of the individual *or* of the nation state. The initial goal is to analyse these components of cosmopolitan theory as the objects of investigation from different perspectives, and to determine which aspects of the various critical theories used here *can* be integrated in order to advance a critical, transformative cosmopolitan social theory. This involves examining these components as stand-alone concepts as well as within the context of cosmopolitanism. The primary goal of this thesis is to provide a cohesive critical cosmopolitan theory with reformulated conceptualisations of autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism that address the problems of their more liberal interpretations, yet retains the core concepts that normative theorists—in my view, rightly—recognise as necessary to cosmopolitanism. This critical cosmopolitanism will provide an alternative position for those global problems that are most often the focus of cosmopolitan theorists. The interdependencies of today demand that countries work together to solve the problems of war, famine, poverty, water shortages, and other diminishing resources. To do so involves challenging the nationalist paradigm of nation states putting their own needs fully and consistently before others, and reconsidering alternative subjectivities to the Western-style individualism that positions the self against the other.

Typologies

Cosmopolitanism has a rich and complex history. In order to build the arguments in the thesis this section will highlight common classifications that have been useful in understanding various branches and positions in cosmopolitan theory. Greek and Roman classical Stoic philosophy grounded Christian philosophy through the millennia and the Enlightenment, whose emphasis on rationality provides the modern foundation for cosmopolitanism. Today, however, the word's meaning changes between disciplines and contexts (Kleingeld and Brown 2009; Scheffler 2001b; Turner 2002: 48). Samuel Scheffler acknowledges that in common parlance, 'cosmopolitanism' connotes worldly sophistication, but also observes that although contemporary philosophical usage is more specialised, there is no consensus on precisely what the cosmopolitan position is (Scheffler 2001b: 111). The theory's cross-disciplinarity adds to the disparities in the definitions of several keywords used in cosmopolitan debates, an issue I address later in this chapter.

With rising interest across disciplines, there are multiple labels attached to similar cosmopolitan positions. Whilst justice and culture generally describe cosmopolitanism's two main areas of focus, the labels 'extreme' or 'strict' as well as 'moderate' are sometimes used in global

distributive justice debates to describe the degree or extent of positions on universalism—in a sense, the limits of cosmopolitanism (Kleingeld and Brown 2009; Scheffler 2001b: 113-115).[4] This is a useful classification because within global distributive justice debates these limits are essentially about the degree of obligation that nations, institutions, or people have towards others. Although Scheffler maps extreme cosmopolitanism to global justice (those theorists generally taking a stricter universalist line), and moderate cosmopolitanism to cultural cosmopolitanism, he maintains that both labels can conceivably apply to either branch (2001b: 115-117).

Normative cosmopolitan theorists are sometimes referred to simply as global justice or global distributive justice theorists because of their relatively narrow emphasis on distributive justice. Typified by Pogge (2002), Charles Beitz (2005), and Simon Caney (2001), they are especially notable because of their views on universalism. They have been considered strict or extreme because of their contention that the principles of distributive justice apply to everyone without exception, i.e. universally (Caney 2005: 29). They contend that 'cosmopolitanism about justice is opposed to... any view which holds, as a matter of principle, that the norms of justice apply primarily within bounded groups comprising some subset of the global population' (Scheffler 2001b: 112). More moderate normative theorists generally maintain a normative liberal perspective, but take a less strict or extreme stance on universalism and may have fields of cosmopolitan interests not heavily focused on global distributive justice. Scheffler provides a useful analysis by describing these camps as two conceptual strands of cosmopolitanism: a doctrine about justice and a doctrine about culture and self, with the latter often referred to as moderate or cultural cosmopolitan theorists (Scheffler 2001b: 111-112).[5] Appiah is a prime example of a moderate cosmopolitan theorist. He discusses global justice in the context of the commonalities of cultures, and in particular his own family's multiethnic multiculturalism. Appiah is less interested in strict definitions of cosmopolitan universalisms, and more interested in how different cultures interpret them (1998; 2006) (see Chapter Four).

---

[4] The extreme, unmodified and strict labels appear to be used interchangeably, depending on the theorist. Here I tend to use strict, but do use all three interchangeably.

[5] Scheffler uses the term 'doctrine' which is commonly used in political theory. I note later in this chapter that different theorists describe cosmopolitanism in different terms, even when they are conceptually similar—many cultural cosmopolitan theorists would take issue with describing cosmopolitanism as a doctrine at all. I utilize Scheffler's descriptions here because he articulates some of the most lucid understandings of cosmopolitan concepts in any field.

Outside of normative cosmopolitanism the debates tend to take a wider view and theorise a more critical cosmopolitanism. I break this amorphous group down into two categories for explicatory reasons only. I refer to these theorists as critical because of their non-normative positions and their focuses on marginalised people (women, ethnic groups, and sexual dissidents, for the most part) and because in doing so their critiques of cosmopolitan theory are significant.[6] In particular, whilst they are concerned with issues such as universalism, autonomy, and human rights, many are critical of those concepts, and may reject the idea of rights in particular and of liberalism in general. Social justice is a preoccupation for this group of theorists, but in various ways and always in contestation. I loosely divide this group between critical theorists who consider themselves cosmopolitans and those who do not or might not but address cosmopolitanism or issues key to it (such as autonomy, universalism, nationalism, imperialism, and difference). For example, of the former grouping Amanda Anderson (1998) has problematised cosmopolitan universalism and its necessity to the concept, as has Drucilla Cornell (2005) by critiquing the Kantian foundation of moral worth based on rationality and by comparing cosmopolitanism to Ubuntu, the southern African quasi-religious belief system. Examples of the latter grouping are Butler's useful work on universalism and autonomy in and out of the context of cosmopolitanism (1995a; 2010), and Jyoti Puri's (2004) and Ranjana Khanna's (2007) postcolonial perspectives on nationalism and the problem of Kantian dignity as an abstract grounding for moral worth, respectively.

Whilst 'social justice and 'injustice' are terms commonly (and somewhat loosely) used by many critical theorists, a narrower interpretation of social justice has been the focus of political theory since Rawls' 1971 publication of the influential *A Theory of Justice*. This publication has served as the basis for nearly all contemporary discussions on liberalism and justice (certain Rawlsian concepts will be referred to regularly in the next chapter of this thesis). Rawls frames social justice as fairness, based on the rationale that people would come to agreements on conceptions of justice (the 'original agreement') in order to advance their own interests. His reasoning is that people would generally recognise this as the only way for any one individual to count on justice for him/herself (1971: 6, 10-15). To that end he attempts a higher level of abstraction by determining how principles of justice, which 'provide a way of assigning rights and duties in the basic institutions of society and… define the appropriate distribution of the benefits and burdens of social cooperation', are chosen (1971: 3-4, 11). He wants to identify the concept of justice,

[6] I use 'critical theorist' in the sense that their positions are not normative, and not that their ideas are directly related to the Critical Theory that emerged from the Frankfurt school.

and his method is to examine its distributive role and the ways in which basic social institutions do this (which leads us to the morality of institutions and states).[7] Contemporary cosmopolitanism retains this interpretation of justice; however, it extends this concept to obligations between individuals and not simply as the responsibility of institutions. The term has a wider interpretation amongst critical theorists, who are more likely to frame justice in terms of social injustices.

I should note that these loosely sketched typologies are largely of my own making for the purposes of this thesis, part of the analytical work of this project and required for the arguments I make here. Theorists move in and out of these categories and change their own opinions and identifications. Nussbaum, for example, was considered a strict universalist but has more recently modified her position (Nussbaum 2008). Whilst I do not use theorists strictly according to these categorisations, I do frequently refer to theorists as normative or critical for ease in indicating basic theoretical positions on cosmopolitanism. Indeed, I do not doubt that some of these theorists would disagree with my categorisations. Butler, for example, remains critical of liberal conceptualisations of autonomy and universalism, but reconceptualises them in terms of radical interdependencies that I would argue are cosmopolitan at their core, without publicly categorising herself accordingly (2004: xii; 2010: 47:10).

A note on terminologies

The epistemological processes that occur within normative distributive justice debates are problematic to many critical theorists, most notably (but not exclusively) because of normative cosmopolitanism's moral (reasoning) framework and dependence on universalisms. Before undertaking a review of key concepts by critical theorists, it is worth establishing an understanding of political and moral philosophy's core concepts that concern cosmopolitan theory in order to avoid misunderstandings of an already multi-layered set of terms.[8] All of these

[7] To clarify Rawls' definitions of major institutions: 'By major institutions I understand the political constitution and the principal economic and social arrangements. Thus the legal protection of freedom of thought and liberty of conscience, competitive markets, private property in the means of production, and the monogamous family are examples of major social institutions. Taken together as one scheme, the major institutions define men's rights and duties and influence their life-prospects, what they can expect to be and how well they can hope to do. The basic structure is the primary subject of justice because its effects are so profound and present from the start… The justice of a social scheme depends essentially on how fundamental rights and duties are assigned and on the economic opportunities and social conditions in the various sectors of society' (Rawls 1971: 7).

[8] An addition note on nomenclature: moral philosophy and political philosophy are often used interchangeably, especially within international relations. Some attach morality to individuals and the

concepts have been subject to debate within political theory and moral philosophy, but in this chapter I will cover them in the more basic fashion, leaving out nuance and extended debates for the analytic chapters.

Whilst some terminological issues are problematic in that they cloud the grounds for debates, some theorists see a positive side to the multiplicity of certain terms. A few have chosen to pluralise cosmopolitanism itself, rather than to insist on one definition or disciplinary approach. Bruce Robbins argues that the lack of specificity is integral to the concept and lends weight to the idea of multiple cosmopolitanisms (Robbins 1998a: 1-4). A cosmopolitanism left open and contingent allows for theorising a new, particular universalism and may reveal potential for transdisciplinary theory not yet attempted. Pollock, Bhabha et al. use the plural 'cosmopolitanisms' in their work. Their particular perspective is an attempt to incorporate feminist theory, which they refer to as 'cosmofeminism' (Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000: 584). They prefer multiple cosmopolitanisms as actions and ways of being rather than as an idea or theory, thus propelling the concept even farther away from ideology than Appiah's cosmopolitanism-as-sentiment does (Appiah 1998: 95; Pollock 2000; Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000: 584-585). They agree with other theorists on the need for historicisation and an investigation into 'cosmopolitan practices that have actually existed in history' (Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000: 585; Robbins 1998: 1). Although their work is substantially distant from the normative, in their call for multiple cosmopolitanisms Pollock, Bhabha et al, echo Beitz's rejection of the extreme/moderate dichotomy. Beitz may not agree with loosening the definition to the point of their 'actions' and 'ways of being' but he does seem to agree that the term should be opened up rather than narrowed. He acknowledges the need for more refined distinctions that

---

political to social institutions, or, as Will Kymlicka and Robert Nozick agree, 'moral philosophy sets the background for, and boundaries of, political philosophy' (Nozick 1974: 6, in Kymlicka 2002: 5-6). Kymlicka then defines political philosophy as 'a matter of moral argument, and moral argument a matter of appeal to our considered convictions'—the question of the moral continuity from the individual to social/state, and the limitations that follow remains (Kymlicka 2002: 6). Rawls' theories blur the lines. His contractarian approach is built on the moral reasoning theories of Kant, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and John Locke, but it is in the context of basic social (i.e. political) institutions as the purveyors of justice as he conceptualizes it (Rawls 1971: 7). Here I use both 'moral' and 'political' philosophy to mean normative philosophical theories on morality. When referring to the discipline, I sometimes refer to 'political theory', though some prefer to see it as the international relations branch of philosophy, depending on the locale (it varies by country). The significance of these arguable distinctions is beyond the scope of this project and would entail unnecessary granularity for it. I apply the term normative to moral philosophy because that is the de facto approach within the discipline, though an important debate within the field concerns the claim to authority, as well as the value of its application to the empirical. These issues will be explored later in relation to critical theorists' general resistance to the 'conquering gaze from nowhere' (Haraway 1991: 188).

can accommodate positions beyond the general opposition between statism (meaning state sovereignty as central to the principles of justice) and cosmopolitanism, or the 'strict' and 'modified' descriptions (Beitz 2005: 16, 18-19). In this thesis, my attempt to reformulate key components does seek to increase specificity in nomenclature to some degree, but I also recognise that some underspecification continues to provide a foundation on which to open up the field's conceptual possibilities in each of these areas.

Opposing uses of some terms sometimes confuse the grounds of debate. Some theorists use 'pluralism' and 'humanism' to describe cosmopolitanism, whilst others perceive them as different. Unlike David Hollinger, Appiah prefers using pluralism to describe cosmopolitan diversity, despite agreeing with Hollinger's general assertion of 'a cosmopolitan will to engage in human diversity' (Hollinger 2001: 239; Appiah 2006) (I discuss Hollinger's use of pluralism in the next chapter). Appiah draws clear distinctions between humanism and cosmopolitanism over the very question of difference. He rejects the occasional charge that cosmopolitanism promotes homogeneity and the banality of humanism by contending that humanism is about sameness, whereas cosmopolitanism actively searches out and embraces difference, so much so that it acknowledges integration as a matter of course (Appiah 1998: 94). Conversely, Paul Gilroy advocates a 'planetary humanism' whilst still considering himself to be cosmopolitan (Gilroy 2004: 4). Gilroy, a believer in the promise multiculturalism holds for his assessment of Britain's national post-empire melancholic state, does not appear to be otherwise at odds with Appiah philosophically, but perhaps understands humanism in terms of human commonality and not "sameness" or lacking a recognition for difference.

Binnie, in separate collaborations with David Bell (2000) and Skeggs (2004), interprets cosmopolitanism in the broadest sense of the word (Bell and Binnie 2004). A cultural geographer, he takes an entirely different approach to the concept. His viewpoint is economic and political, one that reveals very difference perceptions of the concept, and what being (a) cosmopolitan might mean. As I discuss in Chapter Two, Binnie and Skeggs have observed four cosmopolitan discourses: a type of citizenship, an anti-nationalist perspective, a form of subjectivity and a form of consumption (Binnie and Skeggs 2004: 41). In this project I integrate the first three, where Binnie and Skeggs focus on the fourth, which has more of a tangential bearing here because they focus on capitalist flows of consumption rather than more directly on global justice and social injustices, or normative and critical cosmopolitanism (see Chapter Two).

The attempt to reframe cosmopolitan debate by bridging cosmopolitan theory across disciplines and within a historical context has contributed to the theorising of rootedness and similar concepts, but it has also perpetuated the muddying of the field's terminology (Hollinger 1995, 2001). Appiah's versions of 'extreme' and 'moderate' are 'hard-core' and 'rooted' (and less frequently, 'impartial' and 'partial') (1998, 2006). His work is refreshingly interdisciplinary; he clearly advocates the moderate position in his assertion that local and national affinities do not contradict the essence of cosmopolitanism. Hollinger's preference for the more benign term 'unmodified' may be indicative of his desire for interdisciplinary collaboration, and he concurs with Scheffler's taxonomy in his description of unmodified as being more universalist.

Hollinger's significant contribution, however, is in his description of a modified, 'postethnic' cosmopolitanism that hints at pluralism, but ultimately rejects both universalist and pluralist positions. According to him, cosmopolitanism has a universalist left and a pluralist right, but is not quite either (2001: 240). He distinguishes cosmopolitanism from pluralism by arguing that cosmopolitans are interested in exploring diversity, whereas pluralists (especially multiculturalists like Will Kymlicka) want to 'protect and perpetuate' established cultures: 'Cosmopolitans are specialists in creating the new, while cautious about destroying the old; pluralists are specialists in the conservation of the old while cautious about creating the new' (Hollinger 2001: 239-240; see also Brennan 2003: 43). Hollinger's form of cosmopolitanism is more liberal and individualistic, less group-oriented than pluralists'. Hollinger's delineations contribute to cosmopolitan debates on community and multiculturalism, and both distributive justice and cultural theorists have frequently referenced his work. Ultimately, however, these dichotomous descriptions of cosmopolitanism fail to do it justice as the theory evolves. As well, plurality is not always perceived as being on the right; as I argue in Chapter Four, Arendt's plurality as the human condition may be cosmopolitanism's new universalism (Butler 2009).

Also complicated is the term 'universalism'. When I began this thesis 'universalism' started out as 'universality'. The interchange is frequent between bodies of literature. I use 'universalism' as the informal basis for cosmopolitanism's universals (principle beliefs, such as the equal moral worth of all people). 'Universality' is the general concept of the universal, that something is generally true everywhere and all the time, but 'universalism' is often used in its place, as both plural and singular. The concept is not, however, always absolute, and frequently conditional. I discuss cosmopolitan universalism in Chapter Four, referencing in particular the problems highlighted by Caney and Brian Barry.

Cosmopolitanism is sometimes called global citizenship, going back to its Greek meaning of cosmopolitans as citizens of the world. I refrain from engaging in that discussion because I generally consider the term 'citizenship' to be too rooted in exclusion (those who are allowed to be citizens with citizens' rights, and those who are not), which I think is in opposition to the cosmopolitanism's resistance to exclusions and boundaries. I do, however, refer to the term when the context is its use by other theorists.

Throughout this thesis (and particularly in Chapter Five) I refer to the nation state. In literature on nationalism and on cosmopolitanism, it is variously written as 'nation state', 'nation/state' or 'nation-state'. I subscribe to Puri's convention of dropping the hyphen and the forward slash: 'the hyphen indicates a sovereign political territory that is congruent to a single nation, a unified community. This concept invokes the idea that a culturally or ethnically homogenous nation is linked to a state' (Puri 2004: 35-39). She sees 'the interlocking of the nation state as more of a political and administrative effect rather than the outcome of a singular, cohesive nation with the state as its political organization' (ibid.).

Personal interest

> Let us define cosmopolitanism as an ethos of macro-dependencies, with an acute consciousness (often forced upon people) of the inescapabilities and particularities of places, characters, historical trajectories, and fates. Although we are all cosmopolitans, Homo sapiens have done rather poorly in interpreting this condition. We seem to have trouble with the balancing act, preferring to reify local identities or construct universal ones. We live in-between. (Rabinow 1986: 258)

My own interest in cosmopolitanism was piqued by Tagore's book, *The Home and the World* (1985). I have had a lifelong interest in the tension between being an individual and being part of a community, between human being and 'citizen'. Growing up as a tomboy and a lesbian in a Greek family outside of Chicago, I was an insider and an outsider, part of a close family and a close community, but also visibly different. As an adult I maintain that status, being a white, educated, middleclass American who identifies as queer. It has always been apparent to me that although those oppositions created a great deal of distress at times, I was never particularly internally conflicted by them. The lines blurred frequently enough, and through queer activism in the US, I saw insider/outsider boundaries transgressed and constraining identities flouted. Tagore's anti-nationalist stance appealed because it was clear to me that reinforcing boundaries and privileging some over others usually resulted in the pain of social injustice.

Yet it was more than that, because despite witnessing the divisions that difference so often caused, I was raised, sometimes paradoxically, to *enjoy* difference. Despite my family's and community's homophobia and their problems with non-normative gender roles, I experienced moments of openness from family members towards the other that were distinctly cosmopolitan. My maternal grandmother was born and raised in a tiny mountain village in Greece and moved to Chicago when she was 17 to be with her new husband. She lived the rest of her life in Chicago, taking the occasional trip back to Greece but never learning to speak English very well. She wasn't worldly in the most literal sense: she hardly travelled, knew very little about non-Greek cuisines, and spoke no other languages. Still, she had an openness and acceptance towards others in a way that I can only describe as unusual for that place and time. My father was the other great influence in my cosmopolitan family values. He lived for exploring other cultures, and one of the most important lessons I learned from him was not something he expressly said to me, but something he did. He taught the Young Adults Sunday School class in our Greek Orthodox church for a few years, but eventually stopped. His dream of teaching teenagers about religion, including their own, involved taking them to a different religion's place of worship every Sunday and then discussing how they were different and similar, an approach that did not sit well with the head of the Sunday School. Standing by his conviction that we should be learning about others was inspirational to me. In both cases, it was a particular position towards the other that I found so striking. Both my grandmother and my father operated in daily life on the general assumption that the stranger was someone they did not know, but who was always worth knowing.

When I first read Tagore's book, it resonated strongly with me because of those family influences. It was not a moral philosophy, removed from situatedness—not the generalised other—but it was, in a sense, morals and ethics that brought me to cosmopolitanism, through personal, familial experience. Both my grandmother and my father had their blind spots when it came to difference, which sometimes confused me—their actions towards individuals were often contrary to what they said about groups those individuals might belong to—yet each tried to live according to an ethic of not just acceptance, but of learning about and from others. This, I believe, is in part what Rabinow was referring to when he said, 'we live in the in-between', and 'seem to have trouble with the balancing act' (Rabinow 1986: 258).

I saw identity as something that entailed boundaries: something politically expedient for LGBT community and rights, for example, but also retaining the problems of exclusion that seemed to

be part of any particular identity. I began to think about the roles of personal and national identities in terms of boundaries, and saw that normative theorists were concerned with the individual's rights and obligations, but strictly from a liberal point of view. Critical theorists, mostly with a poststructuralist-influenced perspective, theorised the individual and boundaries differently: the individual cannot be removed from the social, and boundaries would always be transgressed because of that sociality. This urged me to think of what cosmopolitanism might look like if it were theorised through the lenses of critical theories. I started with queer theorists because of their interest in identity and boundaries and found overlaps with feminist and postcolonial theorists, especially regarding identity and the other. The overlap between theories is significant, as all of them discuss identity to a greater or lesser degree, and although I use theorists with a feminist perspective most often, the project moved from using critical theories to using critical theorists regardless of the theory with which they might be most commonly identified.

Chapter outlines

In Chapter Two I provide a more comprehensive review of normative and cultural cosmopolitan theories and review the field's key literature. I give a brief history of cosmopolitanism, its relation to liberalism, how theorists categorise different philosophies of cosmopolitanism, and consider the meaning of cosmopolitanism and the problems of over-specification. I then discuss the strengths and weaknesses of cosmopolitan theory and its critiques, and the contributions of critical theorists, particularly in relation to universalism, liberalism, and autonomy. I contrast certain poststructuralist-influenced theorists with normative theorists, especially those considered feminist, postcolonial and/or queer. I draw on critical theorists A. Anderson (1998), Butler (2009), Binnie and Skeggs, who have theorised new forms of cosmopolitanism, especially in relation to autonomy and universalism (2004), Mackenzie and Stoljar (2000a) and Pollock, Bhabha et al. (2000) for differing views on the key concepts and on cosmopolitanism. I contrast their ideas on liberalism, universalism, and autonomy with Caney (2001), Scheffler (2001b), and other normative theorists. By examining aspects of the normative theory through the lenses of critical perspectives, I open up what I propose are the key components to cosmopolitan theory to recuperation, maintaining the efficacy of their coverage but resisting the liberal tendency to impose hegemonic norms. This chapter sets the foundation for the next three substantive chapters.

In Chapter Three, I focus on the role of autonomy in cosmopolitan theory, the conflicts that have arisen due to liberal and other understandings of the concept, and ways forward in reconceptualising it in the cosmopolitan context. Autonomy is a cornerstone of liberalism's emphasis on equality, a sign of its liberating potential and one of its most obvious weaknesses; consequently, it serves as a flashpoint between poststructuralist theories rejecting unified subjectivity, and liberal theories privileging the individual. I investigate autonomy's relevance to universalism as well as to cosmopolitanism. Autonomy in the cosmopolitan context necessarily involves examining its complex relationship to Western individualism, which I unpack by examining several different approaches to autonomy by normative and critical theorists. I draw particularly on feminist theorists who pull autonomy back from liberalism's abstract, transcendent interpretation and envision it as a more relational form in order to account for situatedness and the social constitution of the subject. After examining these different perspectives on autonomy and its relation to individualism, I argue that some form of both is needed for cosmopolitanism. I agree that advocating for a more relational autonomy that takes into account these social interdependencies is a progressive step in reformulating autonomy; however, I show that those theorists who take a more intersubjective approach to subjectivity provide a more compatible autonomy for critical cosmopolitanism because it challenges the self/other binary that I argue hinders cosmopolitanism's valuing both difference and the individual. Amongst other theorists, those most useful in this chapter are Seyla Benhabib, Butler, and Jennifer Nedelsky.

In Chapter Four I interrogate cosmopolitan universalism. Universalism is directly related to human rights, which normative cosmopolitan theorists argue are necessary to alleviate oppression and protect marginalised people. The more moderate normative theorists and critical theorists acknowledge that universalism poses a number of problems, most of them related to its liberal understanding of its key problems. Strict normative cosmopolitan theorists contend that absolute universalisms (meaning no constraints) exist and are necessary to the efficacy of rights. Other critical theorists question the notion of human rights and the concepts on which they are based. Liberal notions of the concept presuppose a neutrality despite a consensus of theorists recognising the particularity in every universalism. That particularity is based on norms that are not universal, at least not wholly, and may well be hegemonic; thus, the universalism may not be in the best interest to those outside those norms, and possibly to their detriment. I examine the scope and substance of universalism, the charges of imperialism and hegemony, the counter-charge of relativism, the apparent reliance on abstraction and the transcendent individual, and

the detachment association to cosmopolitanism's 'reflective distance' concept (Mehta 2000: 624). The concept, in essence, is the attempt to remove oneself from one's own particularity in order to understand and empathise with the other. Whilst this 'detachment' is in line with a prediscursive, unified subjectivity, I show that if the subject is interpreted as mutable and constituted by and through others, this distance is not only impossible but also unnecessary. It is not an ignorance of difference, but a position of acceptance and openness. In thinking through these problems I examine the possibilities for politicisation, notions of plurality, and negotiation from a feminist ethics position as possible ways of addressing problems and conflicts that arise from inevitable disagreements (using in particular a discussion on the subject by Kimberly Hutchings (2004)). I also discuss the southern African ethic of Ubuntu as a way of understanding dignity, mutuality, and interdependence as an example for a recuperated universalism.[9] I use the work of Zerilli and Butler in exploring Arendt's critiques of the nation state and human rights, as well as her cosmopolitan pluralism.

In Chapter Five I focus on nation and nationalism, exploring their intersections with gender, identity, postcoloniality, heteronormativity, and sexuality to understand the problems and tensions in these areas, and how different conceptions of nationalism can contribute to cosmopolitan theory's perspectives on that key subject. I examine how nationalism is dependent on exclusions through (national) identity formation. Using critical theorists' deconstruction of the nation state and nationalism as they relate to the above issues, I explore how national identity is reliant on hierarchies of marginalisations that shape broader meanings of nation, including the notion of women as the body of nation, and the necessity of heteronormativity to shore up nationalist sentiments. I conclude with the question of the compatibility of cosmopolitanism with any form of nationalism or patriotism, arguing that there is no present version of nationalism or patriotism that does not rely on some form of exclusion, making them incompatible with cosmopolitanism's anti-nationalist position. I focus on the work of Enloe, Anne McClintock, Puri, and Ulrich Beck.

---

[9] Ubuntu has no western analogue. 'It is a unifying vision or worldview enshrined in the Zulu maxim umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu, i.e. "a person is a person through other persons"' (Louw 1998). 'At bottom, this traditional African aphorism articulates a basic respect and compassion for others. It can be interpreted as both a factual description and a rule of conduct or social ethic. It both describes human being as "being-with-others" and prescribes what "being-with-others" should be all about' (ibid.). The word is sometimes written in italics as *ubuntu*, sometimes capitalised, other times with only a capitalised 'b', or all in lower case. The variations have been numerous enough that I settled on Ubuntu only for consistency.

In Chapter Six I conclude the thesis with a reconstructed feminist, intersubjective, critical cosmopolitan theory based on the assessments done in Chapters Three, Four, and Five, and return to the work of Butler, Arendt, Beck, and Cornell. I suggest a more comprehensive, coherent understanding of cosmopolitanism and its core components can be had by adopting a cosmopolitan intersubjectivity, which brings these three concepts by rethinking them through the notion of intersubjectivity.

Conclusion

This thesis is structured by my argument that autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism are cornerstones of cosmopolitanism, and whilst associated with normative cosmopolitan theory, are still necessary for a critical, transdisciplinary cosmopolitanism. I argue that by using the work of critical theorists done on these concepts they can be recuperated to construct such a critical cosmopolitanism that addresses the problems presented by the generally liberal interpretations normative cosmopolitanism subscribes to. My goal is to reconstruct cosmopolitan theory in order for it to advance the movement towards peace and social justice.

In the next chapter, I examine more closely cosmopolitanism's provenance and the strengths and weaknesses of its different strands. I present a review of the field's literature, both normative and critical in relation to the main concepts I evaluate here. I discuss in greater depth what I are argue is cosmopolitanism's need for autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism as an introduction to the three substantive chapters on these concepts. In Chapters Three, Four, and Five, I consider sexual rights and sexual dissidents as 'problems' that each concept needs to address. Each substantive chapter in this thesis concludes with versions of these concepts that contribute to my concluding chapter on what my own critical cosmopolitanism looks like.

Chapter Two Overview

This chapter continues the examination of cosmopolitanism's foundations and the complexities of its different perspectives that Chapter One introduced. I give a brief overview of its history, contemporary accounts, and critiques, and then examine its problematic link to liberalism. I discuss the field's key literature that is related to my arguments regarding the necessity of autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism to the concept, and the possibility of their reformulations for a constructive, critical cosmopolitanism. In particular, I contrast poststructuralist-influenced theorists with normative liberal theorists in order to establish the general contours of the theory before moving on to the three chapters investigating cosmopolitanism's three key components, setting the foundation for the following three analytic chapters.

Chapter Two: Contemporary Cosmopolitanism

'The nebulous core shared by all cosmopolitan views is the idea that all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, do (or at least can) belong to a single community, and that this community should be cultivated.' (Kleingeld and Brown 2009)

Provenance

Cosmopolitanism: the word itself stems from the Greek word kosmopolitês, meaning 'citizen of the world' (Kleingeld and Brown 2009). Its provenance is in Greek and Roman Cynic and Stoic ethics philosophies, the historical bases for cosmopolitanism through to Kant's *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (1977a) and *Idea for a Universal History in a Cosmopolitan Purpose* (1977b). Kant is widely considered the founder of contemporary cosmopolitan theory because of those two works and because of his influence on Enlightenment liberalism, which serves as the basis for normative, moral cosmopolitanism (Cheah 2006a: 487; Kleingeld and Brown 2009). The normative theory is often referred to as moral cosmopolitanism and emphasises individualism and rights. Those theorists generally focus on cosmopolitanism as a moral theory and global distributive justice as a human right. There has been renewed interest in the concept in the last two decades, and it has become a topic of debates in other disciplines where the focus is on reconciling conceptualisations of culture, identity and diversity in an era of rapid globalisation.

Cosmopolitan distributive justice

Global distributive justice debates are concerned with two complex questions: where does justice apply, and how should resources be distributed on a global level? In other words, do the obligations of justice apply only between individuals, equally, or between individuals with special considerations for communities? Or does justice apply only within and between collectives, with no global scope of justice if one accepts justice as relative to cultural background (Beitz 2005)? The first two perspectives are cosmopolitan; the third represents a communitarian or liberal nationalist approach. The latter two are by definition not global, and are not formally considered in this thesis; however, the work done by many of those theorists have been influential to cosmopolitanism, and I will occasionally be referring to theorists such as David Miller (2000) when discussing nation and nationalism.

Because poverty and war are the two practical areas of focus, the two primary dimensions of distributive global justice are economic and political. Government oppression and certain types of war, according to Beitz, are due to 'pathologies of the states system', whilst environmental and economic problems require international collective action or participation (Beitz 2005: 11).[10] But the forces of the present global market have benefited wealthier countries whilst they have perpetuated and exacerbated global poverty, which in turn have affected war, starvation, torture, infant mortality, malnutrition, and other justice and quality-of-life issues (Beitz 1999a: 516; 1999b: 3; Pogge 1992: 52-54; 2002: 139-144). Theorists Pogge and Beitz argue that there is a duty to reform this global order and possibly compensate based on the duty not to harm (Beitz 2005: 22-23; Pogge 1992: 53; 2000: 45). The implication here is that any injustice that has international ties falls within the scope of global distributive justice, which, at its simplest is an argument against absolute state sovereignty and for international collaboration.

Normative cosmopolitan theorists—typified by Beitz, Pogge, and Caney—agree on three central tenets within cosmopolitanism that underlie their position. Caney's interpretation of Pogge's tenets stresses moral cosmopolitanism's emphasis on moral worth:

> … cosmopolitanism contains (and derives its plausibility from) the following intuitively appealing claims: (a) individuals have moral worth, (b) they have this equally, and (c) people's equal moral worth generates moral reasons that are binding to everyone. (Caney 2001: 976-977)

And in accepting these universalist moral claims, it makes little sense that any resulting duties or obligations would apply only to fellow nationals and not globally. In a challenge to absolute state sovereignty, cosmopolitanism goes further by contending that because justice is (ideally) blind to culture, sex, or ethnic identity, nationality or state membership should also be morally irrelevant (Caney 2001: 977). Caney's interpretation of cosmopolitanism within distributive justice debates sheds light on why this normative branch of cosmopolitanism is so influential to more moderate and/or cultural forms. He states that the principal cosmopolitan claim advanced by contemporary [distributive justice] cosmopolitans is:

[10] Rawls believed the sources of poverty were mostly domestic and thus solutions must come from the local; he acknowledged that there are certain international obligations that must be balanced with his non-intervention principle, but he was not clear on why he did not consider these obligations as reasons for justice (Beitz 2005: 21-22; Rawls 1999: 36-37).

> …given the reasons we give to defend the distribution of resources and given our convictions about the irrelevance of people's cultural identity to their entitlements, it follows that the scope of distributive justice should be global. (Caney 2001: 975)

Though these cosmopolitan theorists are working specifically within distributive justice, these moral tenets effectively ground moderate and cultural cosmopolitanisms.

Whilst cosmopolitan distributive justice theorists primarily focus on chronic poverty due to the enormously unequal distribution of wealth and resources, and human rights violations due to war and oppressive governments, some maintain that global justice concerns can include any number of global issues within that relatively narrow scope (Beitz 2005: 11, 13). The environment, for example, is a vital global interdependency that has tremendous economic and political implications for virtually all societies. This normative approach supports various interpretations of Kant's theories on justice, state sovereignty, and cosmopolitanism.[11] It also frequently references Rawls' foundational work on justice and philosophical liberalism, and as such is located primarily within Anglo-American liberal philosophy (Beitz 2005: 15). Rawls' major contributions to global distributive justice are based on his 'general conception of justice' as fairness, which is the equal distribution of primary social goods: income and wealth, but also liberty, opportunity, and the 'bases of self-respect' (Rawls 1971: 302-303). Based on that conception, his First and Second Principles and First and Second Priority Rules of justice for institutions serve as guides to both liberalism and cosmopolitanism.[12]

Although the morality of war has been theorised extensively through the millennia, the contemporary philosophy of global justice is arguably young and underdeveloped, at least in its present framework (Beitz 2005: 12, 15). A fair amount of attention has been given to the problems of cosmopolitan distributive justice in the last two decades, including the question of how it can take form in the present global order. Global distributive justice theory can be applied to foreign policies, intergovernmental organisations, humanitarian and human rights law—alongside and intertwined with an 'evolving transnational civil society' of international global non-governmental organisations (NGOs) (Beitz 2005: 11-12). Cosmopolitanism is frequently

[11] As mentioned earlier, Kant is often seen as the founder of contemporary cosmopolitanism; though his ideas between *Perpetual Peace* and later works were sharpened, they were somewhat contradictory—hence, there are conflicts between his cosmopolitan versus nationalist positions (Cheah 2006a: 487).

[12] Rawls' First Principle gives equal rights to 'the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all,' and the Second Principle essentially insists on the greatest benefit going to the least advantaged (Rawls 1971: 302-303).

interpreted as a philosophical perspective or personal politic that can inform governments and social or economic policy makers. Amartya Sen's perspective on economics emphasising global justice is a good example of this (1996).

Moderate and Critical Cosmopolitanism

Whilst cultural cosmopolitan theorists are not encumbered by the comparatively narrow focus of distributive justice debates, their disparate perspectives often mean debates take place on different levels of abstraction. Their different trajectories invite a politics of translation that has yet to develop but that would aid in the terminology miasma described in this chapter (Spivak 1993). This review of moderate/cultural cosmopolitanism will survey a few of the key concerns that are cross-disciplinary, as well as surveying the work of those who are not cosmopolitan but have constructively contributed to cosmopolitan debates.

The mainly traditional, individualist perspectives of Appiah and Nussbaum are both universalist, with some particularity. Nussbaum has subscribed to the Stoic philosopher Hierocles' urging to think of our affections and identities in terms of concentric circles, moving outward from self and family, community, and ultimately to all of humanity (Nussbaum 1996: 9). Appiah has similar universalist theories, but his detailed theories on rootedness distinguish his ideas from Nussbaum's. Where Nussbaum's centre implies a stable subject, Appiah's contention that one can take one's roots (i.e. certain affinities and loyalties) where one goes is less centred (Appiah 1998: 91). He also rejects her opinion that nationality is a 'morally irrelevant characteristic' (1998: 96). His disagreement with Nussbaum over the moral relevance of nation leads him to a discussion on the Enlightenment 'yoking' of state to nation (see Chapter Five), and he suggests that Nussbaum is actually referring to the state. He sees the state as not at all arbitrary, given that it is the political order in which questions of public right and wrong are decided. Appiah does, however, consider nation as arbitrary, but only in the literal sense of the word, defined as 'dependent upon will or pleasure,' and recognises that this does not preclude relevance to our moral reasoning (1998: 96). Indeed, Appiah and Bruce Ackerman insist that cosmopolitanism is fully compatible with the idea of rootedness and possibly a modified patriotism (Appiah 1998: 91; Ackerman 1994: 535). Stuart Hall and Sheldon Pollock, amongst others, seem to prefer the term 'vernacular' over 'rooted' as an acknowledgment of cosmopolitanism's awareness 'of the limitations of any one culture or any one identity and that is radically aware of its insufficiency in governing a wider society, but which nevertheless is not prepared to rescind its claim to the traces of difference' (Hall 2002: 30; Pollock 2000; see also Werbner 2006). These different

characterisations of the attachments or affinities to land, nation, and state are significant to philosophical and cultural debates within cosmopolitanism because they affect the bounds of universalism and how it is conceptualised, and prompt the question of whether or not any kind of patriotism is compatible with cosmopolitanism.

Miller, who is considered a liberal nationalist, rejects cosmopolitanism but recognises the usefulness of engaging in debates on the subject because it challenges nationalist positions in productive ways. Likewise, his views on both nationalism and anti-nationalism have been useful to cosmopolitanism. But because communitarian and liberal nationalist positions subscribe to forms of nationalism, an ideology to which cosmopolitanism is generally opposed, those debates are not included in this immediate discussion. Rosi Braidotti also does not call herself a cosmopolitan theorist and has specifically argued against it. However, she is in agreement with the concept in a number of ways that are seemingly inseparable from cosmopolitanism's recognition of global interdependencies, and her theories on subjectivity and women are highly instructive in pointing out the theory's problematic areas for the marginalised (Braidotti 2006; 2013).[13]

The theory benefits at times from its underspecification by opening up discourses otherwise foreclosed. That underspecification invites multidisciplinarity, though there is also the contention that it is simply an incomplete moral conception (Beitz 2005: 18; Skrbis, Kendall et al. 2004: 117-118). Cosmopolitanism's meanings appear to vary within as well as between disciplines. It has been presented as a metaphor, ethical stance, sentiment, attitude, perspective, theory, or state of mind; and, it has undergone a series of adjectival modifications: vernacular, rooted, critical, comparative, national, discrepant, situated, actually existing. In addition, the adjective 'cosmopolitan' has modified patriotism, nationalism, democracy, postcolonialism, and feminism—some of which seem to be in opposition to basic cosmopolitanism precepts (Hollinger 2001: 237; Reilly 2007).

The frequent conflation of autonomy and individualism, which I address in Chapter Three, appears to be part of that underspecification. Pogge's first tenet regards the importance of the individual and thus implies some kind of individualism, but he is not explicit in defining cosmopolitan individualism. Moral cosmopolitanism is reliant on the liberal interpretation of

[13] For those reasons, I reference her here as a critical theorist with cultural interests, and not as a cultural cosmopolitan theorist.

autonomy, which is most closely associated with Western individualism, and by extension that is the version most closely associated with cosmopolitanism. The term 'individualism' itself is used differently according to context, but its Western connotation of unfettered freedom for individual material and economic gain draws criticism from nearly all corners of critical cosmopolitan theory. In Chapter Three I argue that cosmopolitanism need not be reliant on that version of individualism. Autonomy, on the other hand, is vital to self-determination but does not necessarily imply the unregulated capitalism that Western individualism demands. Both liberal and poststructuralist critiques of autonomy and subjectivity that have emerged from queer, postcolonial, and feminist theorists are something from which cosmopolitan theory can benefit, and they provide key tools of investigation for this project.

Theorists from these areas tend to look at the wider implications of moral cosmopolitanism and address a greater variety of issues (especially regarding race, gender, sexuality, identity, and difference), ones that are further complicated through the consideration of culture and subjectivity taken on by some political theorists such as Nussbaum and her more moderate counterparts. The overlap with distributive justice goals can be seen in the work of moderate theorists such as Waldron, Hollinger, Appiah, and to some degree Nussbaum, who take a more interdisciplinary approach and sometimes incorporate critical theorists' work. They have shown a willingness to engage with critical theorists, especially regarding subjectivity and universalism, where strict moral cosmopolitan theorists rarely acknowledge work on cosmopolitan theory outside their discipline. Critical thinkers such as Amanda Anderson, Braidotti, Butler, and Zerilli have made substantial contributions to cosmopolitan thought via extended cultural, sociological and psychoanalytic debates, whether or not they consider themselves cosmopolitan theorists (Anderson, A. 1998: Braidotti 2006; Butler 1996; 2000; 2004; Zerilli 2009).

The linkages between the concepts theorists focus on are just as relevant as the concepts themselves. Rootedness and nationalism call into question the relationship between individuals' loyalties and society, and emphasise the need for a more fluid understanding of that relationship as we negotiate its importance in terms of affinities and human rights. The notion that subjectivity and agency are constructed and produced from within and through cultural contexts reveals culture to be more complex than something from which one can easily exit when it proves to be too constraining; however, if agency and subjectivity cannot be interpreted or understood apart from specific cultural contexts, cosmopolitanism's insistence that agency not depend on culture or identity is then called into question. This leads to the necessity of thinking

through the concepts of autonomy and agency in ways that take into consideration sociality. The challenges to universalism question the inclusive/exclusive history of citizenship and its compatibility with cosmopolitanism's 'all-inclusive' claim, and point to the basic category of 'human' as historically problematic for the same reason. Charges of neoliberalism and the imposition of Western values are common in debates centring on globalisation, and although they are major accusations that need to be addressed in their own right, they also reflect the problems with terminology described above. Elitism is a widespread charge against cosmopolitanism because of its Western liberal roots, and one that, as I will describe below, ties into the problem of the field's complex and contradictory set of terms.

As productive as these critical analyses and debates have been in revealing the problematic foundations of cosmopolitanism's key components, critical theorists have yet to formulate a critical cosmopolitan theory that definitively identifies all three components as necessary to the theory. Yet if one removes any one of those concepts entirely, the notion of what cosmopolitanism is changes so substantially that it could be considered compromised.

Perceptions of cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism has at times been contrasted with communitarianism because of the different emphases on community versus the global. In the past the debate was often framed as between universalists and pluralists, exemplified by Nussbaum and Kymlicka, respectively (Hollinger 2001: 236, 239).[14] In Chapter One I noted that Hollinger frames the universalist/pluralist debate within cosmopolitanism itself, describing the tensions between the two positions as a 'distinctive doctrinal position' of the 'new cosmopolitanism' (Hollinger 2001: 240). This new cosmopolitanism, according to Hollinger, is not simply pluralist in its recognition of difference, nor is it simply universalist in its principles of justice. Universality and pluralism are reconceptualised to complement each other rather than stand opposed. The old form of universality is rejected as hegemonic, and the old form of pluralism is rejected as relativist. Universality is mediated, and plurality recognises particularity without entirely abandoning the concept of universal principles of justice.

A narrower breakdown of cosmopolitanism defines its legal and moral areas. Here Pogge's definitions are frequently employed in debates within distributive justice. Legal

[14] Nussbaum has more recently changed her position on patriotism and corresponding loyalties. I discuss those changes in the Chapter Five.

cosmopolitanism is 'committed to a concrete political ideal of a global order under which all persons have equivalent legal rights and duties' (1992: 49). This translates into a citizenry of a universal republic, something few cosmopolitan theorists advocate today (although it has produced constructive debates on international law). The majority of normative theorists focus narrowly on moral cosmopolitanism, which 'holds that all persons stand in certain moral relations to one another: we are required to respect one another's status as ultimate units of moral concern' which 'imposes limits on our conduct' and is more abstract than its legal counterpart, but as such is both weaker and more compatible with other ideas (such as autonomous states or self-contained communities) (ibid.). These limits on conduct are moral obligations to others (with implications for global capitalism, for example limiting the extraction of foreign natural resources without adequate compensation), a cosmopolitan tenet to which the vast majority of cosmopolitan theorists subscribe, in one form or another, and regardless of extreme or moderate positions.

Another method of classification involves the rules of justice applying to rights and claims and matters of degree. One can distinguish two versions of the claim to international principles of distributive justice: the strong claim applying such principles to everyone equally and the weak recognising that there are international distributive justice obligations, but not necessarily to everyone. This corresponds to extreme and moderate cosmopolitanism, but the strong claim can be further defined by positive and negative claims. Caney's example of the weak claim is the UK having those obligations to, say, other members of the EU, but not to countries outside of the EU (Caney 2001: 975). He continues his classification of the strong claim into radical and mild cosmopolitanism. Radical has the positive claim that there exist global principles of distributive justice, and the negative claim that there are 'no state-wide or nation-wide principles of distributive justice' (ibid.). Mild only 'affirms the positive claim' and thus allows for possible special obligations to fellow citizens (Caney 2001: 975-976). Caney's focus is on the more prevalent strong claim. The refined theorisation of obligation within the 'strong' claim are important to issues of state sovereignty, international intervention, and duties involving human rights. Caney's advocacy of the strong claim is a reflection of his strict stance and more importantly to this project, his rejection of what he refers to as relativism, an issue I address in Chapter Four.

Theorists' applications within cosmopolitan debates vary because their work often traverses disciplines and typologies. Appiah's work applies to both distributive justice and cultural

branches of cosmopolitanism. He conceptualises cosmopolitanism as a sentiment like patriotism rather than an ideology like nationalism, and he specifically discusses the often-oppressive aspects of culture (Appiah 1998: 92; 2006). Nussbaum also traverses these dichotomous categorisations. She has frequently been called a strict, or unmodified cosmopolitan within distributive justice because she prioritises dedication to all of humanity (Caney 2001: 976). Yet she also readily acknowledged that one has loyalties to intimate relationships, and perhaps to fellow citizens ahead of others as well, making her position more moderate than Caney's (Nussbaum 1996: 9, 135-136). However, before changing her philosophical position, Nussbaum's cosmopolitanism was attributed the extreme label because to her, even those loyalties exist only within the larger framework of world citizenship. The only way to do good overall, according to Nussbaum, is to take care of one's own first (such as one's children), as one cannot take care of everyone (such as everyone else's children) (Nussbaum 1996: 135-136). Her reasoning has led to some confusion as to whether that position is strict or moderate, posing a dilemma I discuss further below.

Like global distributive justice theorists, moderate cosmopolitan theorists are concerned with poverty and capitalism, globalisation, human rights and issues of state, nation, and community; however, the more critical positions place higher importance on identity, social marginalisation, and subjectivity, rejecting political philosophy's top-down, God's-eye view (Haraway 1991: 189; see also Code 1993) and are most influenced by theorists concerned with those topics (Appiah 2006; Waldron 2000). Instead of moral cosmopolitanism's (often) abstract notions of obligation and justice across international borders being the focus with culture and identity as possible factors, moderate and critical cosmopolitan theorists share a focus on culture and identity and how they impact those most often marginalised—justice and obligation per se are somewhat less frequently mentioned. Scheffler is helpful by providing a useful description of 'cultural' cosmopolitanism:

> [it] is opposed to any suggestion that individuals' well-being or their identity or their capacity for effective human agency normally depends on their membership in a determinate cultural group whose boundaries are reasonably clear and whose stability and cohesion are reasonably secure. (Scheffler 2001b: 112)

How culture is theorised differs between theorists, yet they commonly acknowledge that it is not static, but always in flux; that individual identity is more fluid, that change is the more, rather than less, normal condition, and that one need not be attached to a particular culture to flourish but that rootedness can also enhance the quality of life (Appiah 2006; Scheffler 2001b: 112-113,

116; Waldron 2000: 231, 233). Appiah illustrates the multiplicity of identity, and how group norms constantly evolve rather than remain in some pristine, static state by describing his own multicultural background. He sees travelling cultural practices resulting in the 'long-term and persistent processes of cultural hybridisation' (Appiah 1998: 92). As such, the venerated status so often given to culture extends to the desire to protect and preserve it at almost any cost, and one result is the marginalisation of those members who do not conform to their culture's norms and values—with women and sexual dissidents being the common targets (Nussbaum 1998: 54). Critical theorists dispute those perceptions and question the legitimacy of subjecting individuals to norms that transgress universal notions of human rights.

The need for interdisciplinarity has been noted. Within sociology, Beck and Natan Sznaider want to redefine cosmopolitanism by proposing a 'New Critical Theory with a cosmopolitan intent' that calls for a distinctly 'trans-disciplinary' reconceptualisation of the social sciences (Beck 2003: 453; Beck and Sznaider 2006: 1-2). They claim it is the only way to conceptualise society outside of the nation state, addressing the problem they refer to as methodological nationalism (Beck 2003; Beck and Sznaider 2006). From a more poststructuralist perspective, theorists Pollock, Homi Bhabha and Anderson are amongst those who reject nationalism, are suspicious of liberalism, *and* theorise a recuperated, particular universalism that does not require a stable subject (Anderson, A. 1998: 266; Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000). In an effort to envision a cosmopolitanism that is not directly at odds with poststructuralism, Angela McRobbie has done a comparative study of Beck's and Butler's work (McRobbie 2006). She recognises the contribution Butler makes to cosmopolitanism in *Precarious Life* (which Butler has since expanded on), especially through her reflections on new conceptions of sovereign power and nationalism the United States has exhibited post-9/11, new forms of governmentality that have normalised previously-rejected types of incarceration and militarisation, and feminist conceptions of grief, mourning, and vulnerability and violence (Butler 2004). McRobbie contrasts Butler's poststructuralist perspective on subjectivity and obligation with Beck's cosmopolitan self-reflexivity from a sociological perspective that focuses on power relations. Her study of Butler and Beck is a provocative and valuable step toward any type of cosmopolitan integration, and not simply because she is attempting to align two disparate theories. McRobbie's attention to obligation, especially in relation to subjectivity, is still relatively rare amongst critical theorists, and represents only the beginning of what could be a transdisciplinary exploration of those intersections. A more developed, inter- or transdisciplinary theorisation on obligation and subjectivity can also be useful in examining how principles of

morality and justice that are normally ascribed to individuals are applied to institutions and the state. It is not within the scope of this thesis to include transdisciplinary work on obligation, as it is a secondary aspect of cosmopolitanism. But McRobbie's work on Butler and Beck is foundational to any cosmopolitan project that attempts to integrate work from widely differing perspectives by using their commonalities constructively.

The cosmopolitan concept of global citizenship includes a rejection of absolute state sovereignty (Pogge's third tenet) and nationalism (the definition and degree of the latter being subject to more recent debate), which are framed as a threat to human rights and world peace precisely because they are contrary to the concept of global citizenship. The dangers of nationalism are extended to the debate on multiculturalism. Appiah identifies the tendency of collective identities to 'go imperial' (1998: 106). Like Hollinger and others, Appiah de-essentialises cultural difference, and questions the idea of cultural authenticity and the legitimacy of 'cultural patrimony,' or what kind of ownership a group has over objects in, or that once were in, its physical domain (2006: 115-135).[15] At the same time, he questions the international concern over female genital cutting (FGC), body modification, and other cultural enactments on the body (2006: 72-75). He also gives a compelling, but qualified, defence of the British Museum's policy not to return their spoils of empire (2006: 130). He advocates the exchange of ideas, norms, and customs—not just tolerance, which is 'just another value' (2006: 25). Appiah's combination of philosophical and cultural perspectives on how cosmopolitanism is enacted in daily life has been useful in seeing the possible contours of the theory.

This is where cosmopolitanism is proactive, rather than passive. Appiah states that 'engagement with strangers is always going to be engagement with particular strangers,' the key point being that strangers are not one thing; they are not imaginary, they are specific persons with their own values and traits, some that will provide commonalities to be shared with others (Appiah 2006: 98). This, perhaps, is one of the most crucial aspects of cosmopolitanism's understanding of the individual: we are all different in one way or another, and that difference should be acknowledged and respected. The starkest manifestation of the importance of the individual may be in each person's right to exit a group or nation when they feel threatened. Without that acknowledgement, the often life-or-death right to exit is jeopardised. The acknowledgement of

[15] Appiah, however, does refer to 'biological nature' in his discussions on universalism. His point is that culture builds on biology to produce great variety, but some things remain the same. He gives autism as an example of a mental trait that exhibits the same inability to make sense of others regardless of location (Appiah 2006: 96).

that difference, of the difference of every individual, is the acknowledgment of the plurality of life, of living in this world with others who may be similar, but who will always be different by virtue of their individuality. It is in the 'traces of difference' that cosmopolitanism values both the individual and the universalism of plurality (Hall 2002: 30).

As noted, Appiah's concern is explicitly cultural: its role in our lives, how it is valued, its relationship to identity and ethnicity. But his theories on cultural authenticity and patrimony are cases in point for critical theorists engaging with normative philosophy. Like many normative theorists, Appiah does not deconstruct *why* and *how* cultural values come to exist within certain cultures, and what political forces lead them to be held as inviolable. He does not fully examine why the nation of Greece clings to ancient history for its national identity, or why (and not just how), for example, it benefits from appropriating Macedonian history in order to claim Alexander the Great as a fellow Greek. He accepts that it does and tries to determine the legitimacy of the claim. Appiah challenges cultural patrimony by noting that the Acropolis was built by Athenians as members of a city-state, and not by Greeks as members of a nation (Appiah 2006: 119). He maintains that an individual has the ability to have different roots and affinities without conflict, and that those different roots and affinities determine whom that individual is and how they identify. But Appiah stops short of a political assessment of these issues, and his arguments are less convincing for the lack. His theories could benefit from untangling the role of nationalism in the construction of these identities in order to understand how they exclude and include members.

Unlike Beitz, Appiah concedes that the nation state is not only a given, but necessary as 'the primary mechanism for ensuring' basic entitlements are met (Appiah 2006: 163). He argues that although we have special responsibilities to our own, we are still 'citizens' of the world and have commensurate obligations to others. The problem here is the slippery slope to that national collectivity of 'going imperial.' A deconstruction of nationalism and the nation state as a basis for identity is valuable in determining exactly where the danger is, and here Beck and Sznaider's attempt to conceptualise nationalism outside of the nation state can be helpful in revealing different dynamics of nationalism within different political and geographical contexts.

Anderson noted that there has always been a tension between what is perceived as elitism in cosmopolitanism and its egalitarian aspirations, though she ultimately rejects the claim that elitism is inherent in the concept (Anderson, A. 1998: 268). Although this is an interesting observation, the necessity of delineating cosmopolitanism in this way needs further exploration;

there are the possibilities that one is faithful to the cosmopolitan concept and the other not, or that they are different aspects that co-exist within cosmopolitanism. Anderson, Binnie and Skeggs (2004: 39), and Robbins (1998a) observe that part of cosmopolitanism's history has been this association with elitism, and the analysis of cosmopolitanism's relationship to liberalism is helpful in determining the value of the charge. What has been true about the concerns over elitism (and the related Enlightenment legacy) is the continued dominance of Euro-American cosmopolitan discourse, partly because the US is persistently used as an example of cosmopolitan culture. It underscores the need for historicisation within the field, as there have been non-western cosmopolitan cultures, or cosmopolitan threads within cultures (see Cornell 2009; 2010).

Yet the same argument can be made about feminism: it has historically been slow to include the concerns of women of colour and of sexual dissidents (Ang 2001; Mohanty 2003). Whilst feminism still struggles for complete inclusion, it has made great gains over the last two decades and appears to understand that struggle as an always-receding horizon. In this project I address the charges of elitism by evaluating cosmopolitanism's core components, and, like Amanda Anderson, argue that whilst there are problems in certain interpretations of these concepts, viable reformulations indicate that elitism is not inherent in the theory.

Strengths and problems of cosmopolitan theory

Normative cosmopolitan theorists are primarily concerned with the philosophical implications of the global distribution of resources, with the aim of addressing the problems of war and grinding poverty worldwide. The central method for achieving peace and at least a minimum global standard of living is through individual rights combined with some form of internationality. The emphasis on liberalism and individual rights implies a harmonious existence between global democracy, international human rights, and a proactive respect for difference, but there are also potential contradictions. Does the respect for difference favour the individual, or the minority culture? The conceptual basis has much in common with the international human rights agenda, including privileging the individual. If international bodies deem racial and sexual discriminations wrong, those rights trump state rights that may oppose them. However, as a theory for international cooperation and diversity, cosmopolitanism encourages multicultural understanding and respect, which can appear at odds with those individual rights. Depending on one's perspective on rights and claims, this conceptualisation either works for the individual, or to the detriment of minority cultures. In addition, cosmopolitanism's generally anti-nationalist

position appeals to those who believe today's international conflicts are caused by self-interested state sovereignties that as a matter of course put their interests above and beyond any outside their borders, regardless of the consequences. Accordingly, the appeal to the moral reasoning of each individual to make decisions as a human being in the world rather than as a national, coupled with the pro-active valuing of diversity, gives it a rather utopian feel. This advocacy of both diversity and universality can be gratifyingly idealistic, but problematic when trying to pin down its political structure and applications. Because of cosmopolitanism's insistence on individual rights over state rights, and its concern with poverty and war, it is also opposed to multinational corporations that exploit the world's poor and disadvantaged—a criticism of current neoliberal capitalist policies. Cosmopolitanism is in political opposition to such exploitations, but the normative branch also encourages the global democracy project and as such is generally, though not entirely, in agreement with *liberalism* (Held 1995), and not at all with *neoliberalism's* preference for open world markets over the health and wellbeing of the people in those markets. Accordingly, cosmopolitanism's relationship with liberalism is substantial but not one of dependence.

Yet the cosmopolitan advocacy of international democracy and human rights has been used both in support of current neoliberal US foreign policies and by those policies' detractors. Neoliberal conservatives have labelled former US president George Bush a cosmopolitan for leading international efforts to democratise the Middle East. But the dubious logic behind his pre-emptive use of force in Iraq, his encouragement of US nationalism and his disregard for localised self-determination have led others to dismiss this claim and to characterise Bush's actions as distinctly uncosmopolitan (Gilroy 2004: 21). Cosmopolitanism's supporters contend that cosmopolitanism is an antidote to the nationalist fervour that inhibits transnational understanding and diplomacy and undermines international peace processes. Its critics associate it with liberal elitism and capitalism (Binnie and Skeggs 2004: 41; Robbins 1998b: 248). It is a characteristic of the contemporary theory that its amorphous structure can claim the support of those from different ends of the political spectrum, and this ambiguity can cause confusion when grounds for debate have multiple meanings and usages.

A major point of contention within cosmopolitan theory is the degree to which it recognises and supports special considerations for local and state affiliations. Rather than demanding a strict interpretation of global citizenship in place of all other allegiances, some cosmopolitan theorists attempt to accommodate degrees of obligations and allegiances that value familial and

communal (and for some, patriotic) affinities as well. Similarly, the actual duties and obligations individuals and states have towards each other are crucial areas of disagreement. These robust debates take into account a great deal of work done in those areas by communitarian, liberal nationalist, and consequentialist theorists. As a sociologist, Gilroy sees social solutions in a cosmopolitan form of multiculturalism instead of theorising in terms of duty and obligation (Gilroy 2004). Philosopher Appiah also steps outside of the bounds of political philosophy to explore a more multicultural approach to local, national, and global ties (Appiah 1998; 2006). These debates are essentially the debates on cosmopolitan universalism.

The most common charges against cosmopolitanism are directly related to Enlightenment liberalism and its dependence on universalism and individualism. Cosmopolitan theory does propose an all-inclusive but somewhat vague kind of global citizenship, one that transcends cultural and national boundaries to encompass the whole of humanity (Linklater 2002: 317). But it has historically lacked a critical engagement with unequal power relations affecting marginalised groups such as women, sexual dissidents, and those who have been colonised or are living under a colonial legacy. Normative cosmopolitanism rarely recognises the contingency of such terms as humanity and citizenship, nor does it acknowledge that they are heavily contested terms (Butler 1996: 46; Lister 2002: 195). As such, a cosmopolitanism that fails to fully acknowledge the contingency of 'humanity' and address issues of subjugation regarding race, gender, and sexual dissidence effectively fails for many feminist, queer, and postcolonial theorists. Cosmopolitan discourses pertaining to gendered power relations have been rather minimal, with most coming from feminist theorists rather than normative cosmopolitan theorists (Nussbaum is the notable exception (2000; 2008)). The problems of liberalism that have been brought to light by feminist theorists, particularly through the equality/difference debate, seem largely ignored in normative cosmopolitan literature (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000a; 2000b; Phillips 1987: 12-15, 20; Squires 1999: 127). Normative theorists have not focused on the false gender neutrality resulting from the public/private sphere separation that grounds liberal individualism, something that feminist theorists have discussed for decades (Code 1993; Locke and Goldie 1994; Phillips 1999a: 24-25; Young 1990: 165). The equality advocated by liberal cosmopolitan theorists is a cornerstone of that theory's universalist underpinnings, and that it uses this universalism for its advocacy of human rights has serious implications for marginalised groups such as racial minorities and sexual dissidents.[16] For the same reasons, a global definition

[16] I do not use inverted commas around the words 'race' and 'racial' in this project because, like gender, it is a social category. I use it as such, and not as a biological term.

of 'humanity' should not be pre-supposed. Specifically, the same principles of universalism being invoked to protect marginalised people have historically also been used to persecute them (Braidotti 2006; Butler 1996; Gilman 1992). Who, exactly, counts as a global 'citizen'?

The charges that cosmopolitanism relies on the false neutralities of liberal universalism and Western individualistic autonomy have been rebutted with charges of relativism (Caney 2005). Universalist cosmopolitan theorists and critical theorists who reject absolute universalism and stable subjectivity have at times seemed at an impasse. In the last decade both sides have conceded the other's contributions, though the charge of relativism has not disappeared. In Chapter Four, I interrogate different perspectives with the hope of theorising a universalism that resists hegemonic norms. I argue that Arendt's politicisation of the universalism of plurality is the most comprehensive and compatible conceptualisation for cosmopolitanism.

Normative cosmopolitanism in general has failed to recognise and take account of differences that may be seen as irreducible, though the movement towards particularity shows promise. A deeper understanding of nationalism's dependence on heteronormativity has been sparser, despite the theory's anti-nationalist stance. It does address multiculturalism and identity to the degree that they pertain to global distributive justice, but they do not appear to intersect nation, race, gender, and heteronormativity with their affective power vectors as comprehensively as critical theorists have done (Gilman 1992; Ong 1999: 1, 13-16; Stoler 1995; Spurlin 2001: 185, 199). Even within those debates, the challenges to racism are general and vague, and are exactly why these elisions remain might be productively historicised as part of the disarticulation of cosmopolitanism from liberalism. As the founder of contemporary cosmopolitanism, Kant's problematic views on race and women may be embedded in the present cosmopolitan form; however, as I argue in this project, recuperating its core components to address those concerns reveal that Kant's biases need not be considered inherent in cosmopolitanism (Kant [1764] 1960).[17]

[17] Despite his keen observational skills, Kant's early views on women and race are a lesson in racist and sexist stereotyping. 'The Negroes of Africa have by nature no feeling that rises about the trifling… The blacks are very vain but in the Negro's way, and so talkative that they must be driven apart from each other with thrashings' (Kant [1764] 1960: 110-111). On women, they 'have just as much understanding as the male, but it is a *beautiful understanding*, whereas ours should be a *deep understanding*… Deep meditation and a long-sustained reflection are noble but difficult, and do not well befit a person in whom unconstrained charms should show nothing else than a beautiful nature' ([1764] 1960: 78). Yet it appears he understood the importance of difference within difference. Regarding women, despite assuming his readership to be entirely male, he reminded them that '… it is not enough to keep in mind that we are dealing with human beings; we must also remember that they are not all alike' ([1764] 1960: 77).

Strengths and problems of critiques

Critical theorists' engagements with cosmopolitanism are as varied as the disciplines from which they have emerged. The positive effect has been a multidisciplinary interrogation of the concept with a scope well outside of distributive justice, with some theorists advancing a more underspecified conceptualisation. The negative effect has been a somewhat fractured, unfocused series of debates that often end before arguments have been adequately responded to. Debates lack a systematic engagement between theorists discussing similar topics. Terminological issues within distributive justice have multiplied outside of that discipline, even within similar topics. And for better or worse, multidisciplinarity has spawned several different lines of debate in the field. What is problematic is that these lines of debate have not been fully intersected: one debate may intersect with ethnicities and culture, but not with gender or sexuality. Another may consider subjectivity and sexuality, but not race. Most importantly, critical theorists fail to acknowledge the specified components of cosmopolitan theory in their critiques of the theory as a whole.

As I briefly mentioned in Chapter One, Binnie and Skeggs have observed four cosmopolitan discourses: a type of citizenship, an anti-nationalist perspective, a form of subjectivity and a form of consumption (Binnie and Skeggs 2004: 41). The first three are interrelated for the purposes of this project. Citizenship in the cosmopolitan sense idealises political participation without dependence on nationality or borders, even whilst recognising that not all citizens will consider themselves cosmopolitans. But citizenship's history as a determinant of who is included or excluded is problematic to cosmopolitanism's all-inclusiveness, and its usefulness to cosmopolitanism has yet to be resolved. Nation, nationalism, and sexuality are linked in complex ways that are dependent on unitary subjectivity and on the presumed stable relationships between sex, gender and identity. Cosmopolitan discourse as a form of consumption could have future use in analyzing trends in capitalist consumption and their effect on the philosophical positions. As cultural geographers, Binnie and Skeggs examine queer migration, urbanisation and space; but the international aspect of queer diaspora and tolerance in terms of this consumption is only tangential to this project's evaluation of critical theory and normative cosmopolitanism and lies outside its scope (Binnie and Skeggs 2004).

Cosmopolitanism and liberalism are not a single theory, and the collapse of the two sometimes translates to attributing problematic liberal concepts to cosmopolitanism theory. Normative cosmopolitanism does not conform to all traditional liberal tenets. It is, for example, in

fundamental disagreement with the Rawlsian contention that the principles of justice apply to individual societies and not to collections of societies or states; thus, whilst international cooperation might be encouraged, there is no sense that nation states are actually dependent on each other (Caney 2001: 983; Scheffler 2001b: 112). Instead, (strict) cosmopolitanism argues that principles of justice must be unconstrained and apply to the global population without exception, which requires states to work together whilst discouraging nationalism. Poststructuralist-influenced theorists are especially suspicious of cosmopolitanism's contemporary roots. Braidotti notes that for some poststructuralists 'the critique of liberal individualism is a fundamental starting point, and their main priority is how to rethink the interconnection between the self and society in a non-dualistic manner' (Braidotti 2006: 17; see also Cornell 2009; Butler 2008; Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000). This line of thought is key to reformulating cosmopolitan concepts through the lens of intersubjectivity instead of through Western individualism.

However, some of these critiques include the charges of elitism mentioned above: cosmopolitanism is a liberal theory for privileged world travellers who benefit from globalisation's economic returns (Binnie and Skeggs 2004: 42). Such theorists claim that education, privileged travel, and sophistication seem to be required of the cosmopolitan; paradoxically, some critics charge that refugee and diasporic populations also represent cosmopolitanism (Skrbis, Kendall et al. 2004: 119-121). Pnina Werbner disputes these class delineations in order to examine transnational subjectivities, arguing that the privileged, persecuted, and labour transnationals all 'inevitably must engage in social processes of 'opening up to the world'" (Werbner 1999). I agree with Werbner and suggest that cosmopolitanism in any form does not require wealth, sophistication, multiple passports, multilingualism, *or* diaspora. Travel means exposure to diversity, of course, but it is hardly stipulated for maintaining openness to diversity and the other (Hannerz 1996: 104). Yet because cosmopolitan theory has not adequately incorporated the work of certain critical theories, rebuttals to those charges remain inadequate.

Whilst it may appear that cosmopolitan distributive justice is antithetical to any theory that limits the scope of justice to a single society (or any to any group), many moderate cosmopolitans make the case for special relationships demanding that equal allegiance to all citizens of the world has exceptions—namely, for the intimate relationships of family and immediate community (Appiah 2006; Scheffler 2001b). Exactly how these exceptions are morally possible

is often the topic of debates on the concept of rootedness, and on the reasoning behind and value of strict cosmopolitanism.

This reasoning has been called into question. Scheffler calls it Nussbaum's dilemma because Nussbaum's answer to why it is reasonable for us to favour our own first appears inconsistent with her general view (Scheffler 2001b: 118). Whilst strict cosmopolitanism rejects the notion that particular human relationships and affiliations per se are acceptable reasons for special attention and responsibility, the moderate view does not attempt to justify intimate favouritism, but does demand a balanced approach to how, where, and to whom considerations are given. Nussbaum had appeared to cling to the strict interpretation rather than accede to a more moderate stance. However, her international work on cultural aspects of justice and her arguments in the universalism debates indicate a more moderate position, as does her most recent work (Nussbaum 2008). She quotes Appiah stating, 'We shall only solve our problems if we see them as human problems arising out of a special situation; and we shall not solve them if we seem them as African problems, generated by our being somehow unlike others' (Appiah 1992 in Nussbaum 1998: 29). This is a universalist line with an out—she argues for particularity and against 'obtuse' universalism that does not take cultural differences into consideration (Nussbaum 2000: 32, 49). But exactly what a 'special situation' might be, or what difference means is the question, because the implication is that we are like others, a position that presents the potential for cultural imperialism. To some, this apparent paradox is in need of a clearer resolution, and Appiah and Nussbaum have been influential in addressing the issue. Scheffler and others maintain there is no real dilemma, that the attempt to reconcile universalist claims whilst recognising particularity and the importance of community is not an issue; he agrees with Nussbaum that one can be a better cosmopolitan by taking care of one's own first (Scheffler 2001b). Regardless of one's position on the 'dilemma', these issues frame the debate between communitarian and cosmopolitan theorists questioning the value of nationalism, from which cosmopolitan theory has benefited in theorising the problems of both cultural identity and absolute state sovereignty.

A common criticism of the concept is that cosmopolitanism is liberalism without borders. Yet it is also a challenge to liberalism, as well as to patriotism and nationalism. Liberalism's affirmation of the rights of the individual serve as the basis for cosmopolitanism's human rights concerns, but liberalism as such does not recognise the extent of human interdependencies and sociality, nor does it extend duties and obligations to others on a global basis. Rawls himself

asserted that human rights are not dependent on liberalism, and that 'decent hierarchical peoples' are also capable of creating and maintaining just and reasonable societies (Rawls 1999: 68-88). Rawls reiterated his anti-cosmopolitan stance by claiming that cosmopolitanism favours the individual over just and stable societies, which in effect frames cosmopolitanism as more individualist than liberalism (Rawls 1999: 119-120). The important point here is that the oppositions are arguably the same as those to communitarianism, and that some cosmopolitan theorists are as concerned with certain Rawlsian (i.e. liberal) doctrines limiting the scope of justice as with communitarian nationalism (Scheffler 2001b: 114). The relationship between cosmopolitanism and liberalism is complex and fraught with real and apparent contradictions; their common components must be untangled in order to evaluate the worth of the linkages.

Here it is important to note that liberalism is not one thing: Kantian liberalism is not the same as classical Utilitarian or current Utilitarian liberalism (Nussbaum 1998: 57). Moreover, along with favouring traditional liberal tenets such as valuing personal liberty, 'liberal' in the US also implies a concern for social welfare that advocates restrictions on capitalism that has been criticised by American conservatives as anti-American. US conservatives tend to view any form of social welfare as an abnegation of individual responsibility, to many a value central to what it means to be an American. Yet internationally, the growth of multinational corporations and their ever-widening spheres of influence are seen as a form of liberalism-inflected imperialism that in the US is considered neo-conservatism. Liberalism is contextual—it is both a political theory and a philosophy, in its most basic forms. So whilst one criticism of liberalism is that it focuses too much on the individual and not enough on social and subjective interdependencies, another claims it does not focus enough on individual responsibility in favour of social causes. A critique of liberalism and its association with cosmopolitanism, from both the normative and critical positions, would expose what problems are intrinsic to liberalism and what might be, according to Nussbaum, 'a failure of liberal thinkers to follow their own thought through to its socially radical conclusion' (Nussbaum 1998: 65). As well, it would contribute to interdisciplinary cosmopolitan debates by clarifying the meaning of concepts commonly used when referencing liberalism, including some of the key issues examined here: universalism, individualism, and autonomy.

There has been a slippage between individualism and autonomy, with certain conceptions of individualism standing in where autonomy is the more appropriate term (Code 1991: 77-79). The distinction between the two terms, which is one of the central claims of this thesis, is important

because it forces a reconceptualisation of autonomy, setting the stage for a more constructive interpretation of that component. Although poststructuralist theories on subjectivity are sharply opposed to liberal notions of both individualism and autonomy, the distinction between the two terms can provide a clearer understanding of the relationship between autonomy and liberalism, and then of autonomy, subjectivity, and nation. The liberal self requires a prediscursive subject, one that is independent of its surroundings—in a political sense, it is Rawls' original position without the veil of ignorance, yet an abstraction able to float above all materiality and able to be independent of circumstances and location. Rawls' original position relies on universalism, where the veil of ignorance shields any particular interests or concerns that one individual may have and another may not, and unites all into the universal body of humanity. So the original position is representative of a universalist interpretation of difference that is the subject of feminist theorists' rejection of the atomised, masculinised model for the situated subject, and is in stark contrast to poststructuralist conceptions of a non-unitary subject. The disembodied and abstract individual, as either a part of national discourses on independence or equality, or as a theoretical device created to determine how human rights may be agreed upon, is contrary to Foucauldian theory on discourse and subjectivation constituting the subject, and thus is rejected by theorists such as Braidotti and Butler.

Rawls' liberalism specifically reflects US conceptions of the abstract individual in the political realm, and the individual's relationship to nation; thus, universalism's link to liberalism and nation as described here is also distinctly American. Women in the US were originally excluded from individualism because they were not considered to be autonomous; influenced by Locke's Second Treatise that judged the private sphere to be beyond the norms of social justice, the republic decreed only the heads of households (i.e. men) were citizens with full rights (Locke and Goldie 1994). However, feminists are still wary of rejecting liberalism completely because autonomy has also been the grounds on which second-wave Western feminists claimed and won equal rights to suffrage and citizenship (and there are many liberal feminists, such as Nussbaum, who continue to theorise from that philosophical or political perspective) (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000a). Appiah makes the case that the fundamental argument for cosmopolitanism is the autonomy and human dignity that variety enables (Appiah 2005, 2006: 108). Nussbaum is a major proponent of autonomy as an essential component of liberalism and cosmopolitanism, though she, too, uses individualism as a more inclusive term. Yet Nussbaum maintains that the three main charges feminist have brought against liberalism (above) have been failings due to 'specific failings in the tradition's handling of women's issues,' and though many insist these

problems cannot be addressed without fundamental changes to liberalism, she carefully and methodically disagrees (Nussbaum 1998: 58-59). Nussbaum's specific arguments, which are some of the most lucid on the side of liberalism, will discussed in the following chapter. There I argue that the atomised version of the individual is not compatible with critical cosmopolitanism, but demonstrate how an alternative version of the individual as embedded and situated works well with the cosmopolitanism's value for difference.

Theorists' rejection of Enlightenment conceptions of individualism, autonomy, and universalism vary in degree. Braidotti is critical of what she sees as liberalism's apparent dependence on a rooted, stable subject, and she is sceptical of other theorists' attempts to incorporate forms of rootedness into cosmopolitanism; she rejects most forms of rootedness as antithetical to the concept. Her refutation is an adherence to the Foucauldian critique of liberalism and not uncommon, though again it collapses liberalism with neoliberalism and with contested notions of individualism (Braidotti 2006: 13, 17, 256; Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000). Her answer to rootedness is a nomadic, decentred, non-unitary subjectivity that may be theorised as not entirely in conflict with Appiah's idea of rootedness (Appiah 1998: 91; Braidotti 2006: 75). The question here is whether the concept of 'taking one's roots with you' is in the same realm of conceptualisation as 'nomadic and decentred,' the goal being to theorise the 'tension between fixity and fluidity' as non-oppositional (Skrbis, Kendall et all 2004: 117). Pollock and Bhabha are more willing to call themselves cosmopolitan whilst engaging in similar poststructuralist critiques of the subject (Pollock 2000; Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000). They are in agreement with much of Braidotti's notions of nomadic subjectivity; and like her, they are highly critical of the neoliberal form of liberalism. Bhabha et al. do acknowledge the value of liberalism's emphasis on equality, and even the necessity of a 'rights culture,' but because they insist that today's cosmopolitanism is neoliberal, individualist, and a 'victim' of modernity and capitalism, they consider it unrealised and poorly theorised (Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000: 581-582).

Despite some very different ways of theorising universalism, many normative and virtually all critical theorists agree that its issues must be thoroughly addressed before cosmopolitan theory can progress. The common goal is a recuperated universalism, one that takes particularity into consideration. Appiah's concept of rootedness appears to be the normative baseline. It is often referred to in different contexts and disciplines, but several theorists propose their own versions that reflect their perspectives on subjectivity. Pollock, Bhabha et al. espouse a vernacular cosmopolitanism. They, like Appiah, Waldron, and Amanda Anderson are interested in

theorising new forms of universalism that consider particularity, are not hegemonic and are not based on a masculine norm (Anderson, A. 1998; Appiah 2006; Pollock 2000; Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000; Waldron 2000). Whether or not the concept of rootedness, or its related universalist theories, presents potential for avoiding the hegemonic aspects of Enlightenment universalism remains to be seen.

Conclusion

The three components of cosmopolitanism that I focus on in this project are complex and interrelated. The bodies of literature pertaining to autonomy, universalism, and nationalism are large, theorised together or separately; however, the overriding goal, whether within cosmopolitan theory or not, overt or subtle, is social justice. The thread of concern for people across borders runs through the numerous critiques discussed in this chapter, whether they are from normative cosmopolitan theorists debating nationalism and distributive justice, cultural theorists debating the relationship of community, culture and identity, or critical theorists from diverse disciplines disputing any number of the theory's strands. The conceptualisations of 'cosmopolitanism' themselves differ widely, with its boundaries and forms vigorously debated in the normative branch, and its cultural and political consequences argued in the more moderate, cultural branch. Those outside the field question its very foundations of political liberalism's autonomy and universalism, but rarely together, and especially not in conjunction with cosmopolitanism's anti-nationalism. Still, many appreciate cosmopolitanism's aspiration of a world without nationalism and its embrace of diversity and difference. And some interpret it as a movement very far from its philosophical roots. Yet many of these discussions are unclear because of the multidisciplinary interpretations of specific terms, which cloud debates on the key areas of liberalism, autonomy, and universality. Still others value the openness of the field and prefer different trajectories to develop rather than allow disciplinary constraints.

What cosmopolitanism *is* continues to be a major topic of debate. Debates may best benefit by theorists accepting the wider meaning, that a cosmopolitan perspective may be an attitude, politic, philosophy, behaviour, and/or morality, but that it is not dependent on travel, wealth, worldly sophistication, or multilingualism. Experience and exposure to difference certainly help in the self-formulation of 'the discursive positioning of the cosmopolitan' (Binnie and Skeggs 2004: 42). But I suspect it is not all about experience—is it not possible that the person who is born, lives, and dies in a small, remote village might hold cosmopolitan ideals without ever leaving their home? What appears to me to be central to a cosmopolitan perspective is an open-

mindedness, a willingness to engage with and respect the other when encountering diversity and discovering the other within. It is the core concept of obligation to others regardless of national borders that may be most important. It is what allows, for example, Appiah's father to define himself as a citizen of the world without using the word, even though he was a worldly man (Appiah 1998: 91). Indeed, one may not need to be familiar with the term to hold its ideals of rights and obligations. What those obligations are is not, at the moment, obvious.

Within cosmopolitanism's disciplinary home, it does not answer critical theorists' charges that it does not address the needs of those socially marginalised, that it does not consider the restrictive meanings of humanity and citizenship, or the white, heterosexual, masculinised norm for the individual. It becomes clear that there is an interdisciplinary need for its historicisation and the disarticulation of cosmopolitanism from its liberal roots in order to evaluate its reliance on universalism and autonomy. Can the importance cosmopolitanism places on diversity be reconciled with its own, or indeed any kind of universalism? Can normative theory's most central themes work with a feminist and/or poststructuralist understanding of intersubjectivity and identity, and a thin, particularist universalism? If so, it is possible to develop a critical, transdisciplinary cosmopolitanism that takes into consideration social marginalisations of all kinds. After a review of the literature, my sense is that social marginalisations are the sticking point for all three core components. Each one as currently theorised in normative cosmopolitan theory ignores real-world concerns for those who are left out of liberalism's concepts of justice. This thesis, by contrast, works through cosmopolitanism's core components to evaluate them and determine if a reconceptualisation of each can enhance cosmopolitanism by addressing those concerns.

Chapter Three Overview

The next three chapters examine different conceptualisations of the key components I argue are necessary for a critical cosmopolitanism: autonomy, univeralism, and anti-nationalism. These chapters analyse differing accounts and interpretations of these concepts from a variety of disciplines and theorists, a necessary step in the exploratory and analytical work needed to determine which formulations are most suitable for this critical cosmopolitanism. Whilst I refer to the work of a number of different theorists, the most influential and constructive to this chapter are Benhabib, Butler, and Nedelsky.

This chapter focuses on why autonomy is integral to cosmopolitanism, how it is linked to liberalism, and what the basic critiques of liberal autonomy are from critical theorists, particularly feminist theorists. I argue that this common liberal conception of individualistic autonomy upon which moral cosmopolitanism is based is problematic and not compatible with a critical cosmopolitanism that acknowledges mutuality and social context. I propose that a relational understanding of autonomy is a minimal requirement for a cosmopolitan conception of autonomy, but that an intersubjective account of autonomy is more complementary to the basic concepts of cosmopolitanism. In doing so, I explain how an intersubjective form may even be necessary for a more coherent, egalitarian cosmopolitanism that can answer the most common charges against it.

I conclude that a more poststructuralist interpretation of autonomy is most compatible with critical cosmopolitanism because its integration of relationality and sociality enables it to resolve the Western self/other binary that serves as a stumbling block for cosmopolitanism's valuing the other and difference. I also argue for a form of the individual as the bearer of human rights, whilst rejecting this atomistic self/other binary that sets the relations in opposition to each other. In the next chapter, I follow up this argument with a similar interrogation of moral universalism.

Chapter Three: Autonomy

Introduction

'What some value as autonomy may not be what others are criticizing.' (Friedman 2003: 3)

In what I have said so far, I have proposed that cosmopolitanism rests on autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism as essential structural components. Contemporary moral cosmopolitanism links these components through subjectivity: one of the most obvious examples of this link is moral cosmopolitanism's universalisation of autonomy, employing a liberal understanding based on the abstract, prediscursive, atomistic individual. Critiques of cosmopolitanism frequently problematise this version and call into question the unitary subjectivity associated with liberal autonomy.

Autonomy and universalism have both been highly theorised concepts in liberalism, independent of cosmopolitanism, yet even in that field there is no agreement on a definitive interpretation of either one (Brydon 2004; Held 1995: 166). This has been the case historically, but it is also reflective of the changing face of liberalism. In the last two decades, many liberal theorists have considered feminist and poststructuralist contributions to theorising subjectivity, especially in terms of relationality and the social (Mackenzie and Stoljar: 2000a). This development has led to a rethinking of autonomy and universalism that leaves both less extreme and more contingent. Autonomy is pulled back from liberalism's abstract, transcendent interpretation and takes on a more relational form in order to account for situatedness and the social constitution of the subject (Benhabib 1992b; Mackenzie and Stoljar: 2000b). Autonomy's link to universalism (further discussed in the next chapter) also changes when considering particularity to account for difference: conceptions of autonomy differ as the need for it changes in different locales (Anderson, A. 1998; Mahmood 2005).

Theories of autonomy generally fall into one of two categories: group rights and diversity or individual rights or subjectivities, though some philosophical debates on equality dispute this categorisation (Barry 2001: 118-123; Brydon 2004: 691-692; Galston 1995: 521). This chapter is solely concerned with individual autonomy, both regarding rights and subjectivities.

In broad strokes, individual autonomy represents or is related to a number of values, such as freedoms (especially negative ones), self-determination and agency, individualism,

independence, self-knowledge, and self-reflection. Autonomy is a cornerstone of liberalism's emphasis on equality, a sign of its liberating potential and one of its most obvious weaknesses; consequently, it serves as a flashpoint between poststructuralist theories rejecting unified subjectivity and liberal theories privileging the individual. Autonomy has come under attack not only from poststructuralist theorists, but also from communitarian and liberal feminist theorists as well (Kymlicka 2002: 244-246, Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b).[18]

Autonomy is perhaps most often thought of as self-government (Baumann 2008: 446; Nedelsky 1989: 10). Within that general definition, contemporary liberalism commonly theorises individual autonomy either as 1) a form of independence in acts and agents, or 2) a form of coherence or rationality in acts and agents (O'Neill 2000: 29). The first is considered relational and graduated, '*from* something… and may be *more or less complete*' (ibid.). The second is not relational or graduated. It is inherent in people, or at least the capacity for autonomy is inherent, and for some theorists the basis for dignity—it is not something hard-won, or an indication of self-sufficiency or independence of judgment, as the first is (ibid.). In the simplest terms, the first form depends on what one's situation can cultivate or allow for. The second is inherent and something every reasoning human being has in one form or another, no matter how constructed the first form may be. One is dependent on collectivity and thus relational; the other is a universalised characteristic of the individual. Framed as such, the debate on individual autonomy appears to represent the oppositional relationship between the individual and the collective.

Whilst the debate continues over which account is correct, I understand them as separate but linked, and not necessarily oppositional. Autonomy is a large and controversial subject, and it appears that Onora O'Neill is discussing two different concepts altogether. Indeed, autonomy has few traits that all theorists agree upon. Individual autonomy is often conflated with Western conceptions of individualism, and O'Neill's first definition seems to be conflated with agency or some form of self-definition or self-determination—perhaps 'agentic autonomy' (Abrams 1998-1999: 806, 809). To normative cosmopolitanism both ideas are integral: a respect for the inherent autonomy of the individual is part of the moral worth (and to some, dignity) of the individual, as referenced in Pogge's and Caney's definitions; and, the agentic capacity for self-determination is necessary for one to change one's surroundings—if one so desires—including

[18] Communitarians and feminist theorists have critiqued the abstract, autonomous man concept in similar ways, but I use feminist critiques for the most part here. I refer to several of these theorists elsewhere in this thesis, and I am more interested in cosmopolitanism's relationship with feminist theory rather than in the communitarian position, which is not compatible with cosmopolitanism (Kymlicka 2002: 336).

above all the right to exit. But although the capacity for that inherent autonomy may exist in everyone, how it develops and is understood by the individual is particular and contextual. People do not develop a sense of any kind of autonomy outside of their sociality, even if there are significant similarities across geographies and histories. How self-determination and agency are conceived varies widely even amongst non-liberal feminist theorists, and like different conceptions of autonomy, these differences are major topics of debate (self-determination as a positive value has its limits even in the liberal context).[19] However conceived, a key cosmopolitan position is that some forms of autonomy are required if one is to be able to change one's surroundings. It is worth considering that though one may not have 'autonomous agency' if one is subjugated, it does not mean that one should not (if one being deprived or denied by external forces). It is part of all cosmopolitan positions that individuals should be able to change their environment if subjugation is at issue. Such agentic autonomy may not be inherent, but should be cultivated for one to be truly self-determining (Held 2005: 21). This position is contentious, particularly to feminist and postcolonial theorists, if only because the phrase 'should be cultivated' immediately indicates externally imposed norms. Yet if one takes the basic cosmopolitan position, which includes self-determination in order for the right to exit to be exercised, it is a difficult point to argue.

To reiterate, cosmopolitanism's requirement of autonomy is based on the importance it places on the individual's moral worth and the right to self-determination. Cosmopolitan theory integrates two sets of values: of the individual, and of a kind of global collective that diminishes or rejects the importance of national and geographic boundaries by privileging the individual in a way that universalises how the individual is valued. It is the universalised, liberal construction of the autonomous individual that poses problems for those who do not fit that model, or for those who subscribe to a less atomistic subjectivity. What this model is based on, how it is problematised and what alternatives might be more useful to cosmopolitanism will be discussed at some length here. It is worth reviewing, at this point, Pogge's three defining features of cosmopolitanism, which are perhaps the most often taken up by other theorists.

- *Individualism*: the ultimate units of concern are *human beings*, or *persons*.

[19] Kymlicka discusses the confusion between self-determination and personal responsibility, and points out that for those 'not well equipped to deal with the difficult decisions life requires', chalking up one's circumstances to self-determination amounts to indifference and not concern (Kymlicka 2002: 212-215). Nevertheless, in the context of changing one's situation if one so desires, it is difficult to imagine of self-determination as being unnecessary.

- *Universality*: the status of ultimate unit of concern attaches to *every* living human being *equally*.

- *Generality*: this special status has global force. Persons are ultimate units of concern *for everyone* (Pogge 1992 48-49).[20]

Pogge's 'individualism' is the autonomy at the heart of cosmopolitanism. It privileges the concern of all humans equally and above groups, and requires the 'power' of self-determination and moral choice. Nussbaum describes what self-determination is in the context of liberalism:

> At the heart of this [liberal] tradition is a twofold intuition about human beings: namely, that all, just by being human, are of equal dignity and worth, no matter where they are situated in society, and that the primary source of this worth is a power of moral choice within them, a power that consists in the ability to plan a life in accordance with one's own evaluations of ends. (Nussbaum 1998: 57)[21]

Self-determination or agency in turn requires some form of autonomy, and what those forms consist of will be explored in later sections. First, however, it is necessary to examine the liberal conception of the individual and its relation to human rights. Nussbaum maintains that liberalism's 'twofold intuition' of dignity and moral choice and its core tenets of the equal moral worth of all people are linked to Greek and Roman Stoic thought (Nussbaum 1998: 57). These are also cosmopolitanism's roots, and it is why some hold that it is liberalism that provides cosmopolitanism with its key ethical content (Langlois 2007: 29). Yet cosmopolitanism begins its departure from liberalism by widening its scope with the addition of the 'citizen of the world' claim by Cynics and Stoics, a position that has always set it apart from liberalism. However, it is considered a liberal theory today because the contemporary tradition descended directly from Kant's *Perpetual Peace* and is based on Enlightenment-era egalitarian conceptions of autonomy, individualism, reason, and moral worth upon which contemporary liberalism is based (Code 2000: 183; Kant [1795] 1977a; see also Nussbaum 1998: 56).[22] It is this Enlightenment legacy of

---

[20] For an in-depth discussion on the first, see Chapter Three. I focus more on the second and third in this chapter.

[21] This is a common theme that runs through cosmopolitan theory. In her Capabilities Approach, Nussbaum calls this the 'principle of each person as end'; David Copp calls his version 'the basic needs principle', where the state is obligated to cultivate 'favorable circumstances to enable its members to meet their basic needs' (Copp 2005: 39-43; Nussbaum 2000: 56).

[22] As noted in Chapter Two, there are different kinds liberalism based on a variety of philosophical positions. Kantian liberalism is not the same as classical Utilitarian or current (economic) Utilitarian liberalism, and within moral cosmopolitanism, it is generally the Kant, Rawls and Mill positions, and classical Utilitarian traditions that its concepts are based upon (Nussbaum 1998: 57).

the universalised conception of the individual on which the normative cosmopolitanism conception is based, and that it shares with liberalism.

Because of Pogge's 'generality' and 'universality' of that special status of moral worth (meaning it pertains to everyone, regardless of who or where they are), cosmopolitanism's concern for the individual also implies that we all have certain moral obligations to each other everywhere and that there is indeed an essential thread of moral worth and obligation that runs through the millennia's cosmopolitanisms. To most normative cosmopolitan theorists this means that liberalism's principles of justice apply to all through the language of individual rights, such as the constitutional rights of the individual under US law.[23] This extends to global human rights as well, such as the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). The protections these different sets of rights offer differ. In the US, they are protected and enforced by law; the UDHR is referenced as guidelines, usually in international contexts.[24] As such, moral cosmopolitanism's roots in liberal theories of justice are based not only on moral obligations to others, but on its extension to individual rights as well. The political theories these rights are generally based on include (as in the case of the US) the social contract, which further cements the notion of the autonomous individual as abstract, unitary subject that is set in opposition to the state/collective. (As Kymlicka points out, the social contract is based on an assumption of what the individual might agree to in a pre-societal state of nature. As popular as the notion was for Hobbes, Kant, Rousseau, and Locke, many modern critiques fail it for the sheer implausibility of its abstraction to the mythical state of nature (Kymlicka 2002: 60-61)).

This fundamental concern for the individual over society requires some conception of individual autonomy that, for contemporary liberalism, has been based on Kant's noumenal self: the atomistic, rational, transcendent, and universalised model of the individual (Benhabib 1992b: 161; Braidotti 2006 11-16; Butler 1995b; Code 2000: 182-183; Galston 1995: 521; Nussbaum

[23] The principles of justice, broadly speaking, pertain to equality and freedom. Which liberties these include (freedom of expression, freedom conscience, the right to personal property and that is related to self-ownership) vary according to which liberal tradition (e.g. classical, social, etc.) and which particular philosopher.

[24] Although there are currently no international laws that enforce the DHR, its inclusion of women has helped set the tone for women's rights worldwide. 'By expressly including women, by alluding to freedom from want, and by evoking the U.N. Charter's commitment to better standards of life, the Preamble signals from the outset that [the Universal Declaration of Human Rights] is not just a "universalization" of the traditional eighteenth century "rights of man," but part of a new "moment" in the history of human rights. …[t]he Universal Declaration belongs to the family of post-World War II rights instruments that have attempted to graft social justice onto the trunk of the tree of liberty' (Glendon 1998: 1164).

1996: 133). Although useful in important ways, this individualised conceptualisation poses three major problems for cosmopolitanism. The conception of the abstract individual as a unitary, stable subject does not account for the social, which feminists and other critical theorists believe is a more realistic understanding of subjectivity. Pogge's phrasing that frames individuals as 'ultimate units' further implies a bounded, atomistic subject. But given the importance that cosmopolitanism places on connectedness and the idea of a global community, this model is not necessarily a good fit. A second and related problem is exclusivity. Despite a presumption of neutrality as regards gender, race, and other 'difference', this model of the individual has historically been based on the dominant Western, heterosexual, white male. It has effectively excluded women and many other minorities from citizenship, and in some cases from the category of human itself. A third problem related to both is its hegemonic Western centricity, again despite the claim of neutrality and universality.

Braidotti gives a classic critique of this model that manages to include all three charges. She charges liberalism with relying on self-evidential claims and using 'philosophical reason as a moral crusade' (specifically regarding Nussbaum's liberalism, which her critiques hold as representative) (2006: 17). She claims that the history of moral philosophy has become so imbued with Kantian liberalism's transcendent individual as the archetypal object of philosophy that the (postmodern) notion of a situated, non-unitary subject is still widely ignored by normative theorists; yet, the liberal notion of the subject hinders the development of new ethics (2006: 12-13). Consequently, she has been critical of cosmopolitanism and of Nussbaum in particular. As Holger Baumann and others pointed out (perhaps a bit idealistically), 'the question is no longer whether autonomy has social conditions, but rather what these conditions are and how they are to be conceptualized' (2008: 447; Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 4). But as Braidotti demonstrates, the model remains a stumbling block to productive debates on cosmopolitan conceptions of autonomy.[25] Although critiques of this form of autonomy have

[25] Braidotti does support Bhabha's 'de-westernised' cosmofeminism, and continues to work on progressive accounts of cosmopolitanism (Braidotti 2006: 17). Even Kant acknowledged a somewhat more relational sociality than is commonly attributed to him. Reason, according to him, does not exist in isolation. O'Neill interprets Kant's notion of 'the public uses of reason: 1) To think for oneself; 2) To think from the standpoint of everyone else; and 3) Always to think consistently' (O'Neill in Rossi 1998: 72). Kant's uses of reason are clearly directed at the individual, but the second reason places the individual in a social context that is not only about [defining] social interactions between autonomous individuals (ibid.). It also demands imagining oneself as other (Kymlicka 2002: 408). Nevertheless, both Rawls and Kant maintain that 'the self is prior to its socially given roles and relationships, and is free only if it is capable of holding these features of its social situation at a distance and judging them according to the dictates of reason' (Kymlicka 2002: 221; see also Rawls 1971: 560; see also Taylor 1979: 75-8, 132-133).

existed for decades, the abstract, transcendent version continues to pervade normative cosmopolitan thought and critiques (and governmental/state politics), even as theories of relationality and intersubjectivity gain importance.

The link between liberalism and autonomy is further complicated by the frequent slippage between 'individualistic', 'individualism' and 'individual', thus assigning the abstract, bounded version of the individual, as well as the individualism vaunted in neoliberal conservative thought as the de facto understanding of the term. Although autonomy in some form is necessary for cosmopolitanism, valuing the individual does not presuppose liberal individualism, which has stood in for autonomy in many critiques (Code 1991: 77-79; 2000).[26] The perpetuation of this conflation has led to the common misunderstanding that valuing the individual requires a unitary, centred, and stable subject. Subtracting liberal individualism and keeping a reconstructed autonomy, then, will result in a more coherent, viable cosmopolitanism that values individuals and the sociality that constitutes them.

Rights

> Simply put, cosmopolitanism and human rights are the two primary ways of figuring the global as the human. Both phenomena are generally viewed as placing actual and normative limits on the efficacy of national culture and the sovereignty of the nation-state. (Cheah 2006b: 3)

Cosmopolitanism is linked to global human rights, and the right to exit and the right to be free from coercion both depend on autonomy. If rights are to protect individuals' interests, liberty and self-determination would be features of these interests; if not, they would be someone else's interests (Ingram 1994: 9). Here, autonomy and agency are inevitably linked, but they should not be confused. Some form of self-determination is necessary for rights and for the agency required to exit one's oppressive environment. Rights are necessary for exit and for freedom from coercion—witness the value placed on the notion of human rights worldwide, in foreign relations, in the context of asylum and refugee statuses, and most countries' rules of law. Therefore, whilst agency's relevance to autonomy may be reconceptualised to account for cultural variations, both agency and autonomy remain requirements for a cosmopolitanism that incorporates human rights. To put it another way, although certain factors (economics, familial

[26] Nussbaum points out that many feminist critiques of liberalism are in reality critiques of economic Utilitarian liberalism, which is not compatible with Kant or Mill (Nussbaum 1998: 57). But even Nussbaum has used 'individualism' and 'individualistic' in more expansive and undefined ways (Nussbaum 2000: 189).

dependants, etc) may make it difficult or impossible to change or leave one's surroundings, without agency exit is impossible from the start.

The rights to exit and freedom from coercion are particularly important to certain marginalised groups, most often women and sexual dissidents. Because one of the most dire aspects of living under oppression and subjugation is a lack of recourse, the availability of exit (as problematic and undesirable as it may be, for ties can bind) is always necessary as a last resort—and liberals, cosmopolitans and others would agree, a fundamental right based on some form of autonomy. Women under the threat of honour killing and those facing coerced genital cutting are only two situations where the right to exit is sometimes deemed necessary for survival.[27] Men who have sex with men (MSM) are often in circumstances no less dire: witness the accounts of torture, fatal torture, and capital punishments for MSM in Egypt, Iraq, Uganda, and Iran (Alsop 2009; BBCNews 2001; Healthwatch 2008; Human Rights Watch 2005; Petrelis Files 2009). There, too, the right to exit seems necessary and humane, because the socio-political situations in those countries do not appear to be changing anytime soon. Freedom from coercion is more complex, as it brings up a number of questions easily compromised by colonial and imperialist historical perceptions (what constitutes coercion and choice, etc). Though human rights agendas such as UDHR do not necessarily use the term, the intent to protect people from 'coercion' is clear.[28] And the right to exit is often the last alternative to withstanding such coercion.[29]

In nearly all cosmopolitanism theories, those human rights become fairly meaningless if there is no hospitality on the other side of exit. The hospitality obligation of contemporary cosmopolitan theory was developed by Kant, who stated that a country is obliged to host a refugee *if* turning

---

[27] Here, in the context of autonomy and agency, I am referring to those whose choice is to refuse *without coercion* to take part in those actions aimed at them (Meyers 2000a: 470). There is autonomy and agency in the choice to agree as well, but that is less my concern here.

[28] For example, Article 16, Section 2 of the UDHR states, 'Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.' Nevertheless, forced marriages continue to be prevalent in many societies.

[29] The right to exit is no doubt a complicated one, and it is tied into the question of false universals, something I discuss in the next chapter. Though not within the scope of this thesis, cosmopolitan harm conventions (CHC) are an important part of these debates and closely tied to obligation in cosmopolitan ethics (see Andrew Linklater's 'Cosmopolitan Harm Conventions' in *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (2002)).

them away would result in death ([1795] 1977a: 105-106).[30] States must be willing to give asylum to those refugees, even if the first state objects on grounds of sovereignty. This demonstrates two related aspects of cosmopolitanism's valuation of the individual: 1) individuals have human rights, and 2) others (namely, nations and states, but also individuals) have an obligation to see that those rights are observed.[31]

A rights-based approach to justice is not, however, unproblematic. It was historically tied to private property, and the rights-based culture in the US, for example, is heavily weighted towards the individual and not the collective (Nedelsky 2003: 129). Although cosmopolitanism favours the individual over the collective, its potential lies in a healthy balance, and the collective aspect of cosmopolitanism has yet to be fully theorised. It remains, however, a cosmopolitan universal right to change one's locale, especially if one is in need of asylum. I argue here that one key to a successful rights-based approach to justice would be to disregard the 'rights-as-limits' interpretation that pits individual autonomy *against* the state (as a coercive force) in favour of a system that cultivates and affirms the autonomy of the individual as a state responsibility; this is in keeping with relational autonomy theorists who posit that autonomy is only possible through its relationality (Nedelsky 1989: 31-35).

Accounts and critiques

> Autonomy… is the principle that ensures individual and collective fulfilment and that confers legitimacy on collective decision-making within Western traditions of theorizing the self and the state…. Autonomy functions as a value, a regulative ideal, and a process. It is always a matter of degree, because autonomy (even at the individual level) is a social concept that governs relations within a social world. There can be no absolute autonomy. (Brydon 2004: 3)

Earlier, I described three main charges against individual autonomy. It is worth pursuing different accounts of autonomy here because they generally expose aspects of autonomy that not included in every one. The 'individualist' critique focuses on the abstract, atomistic man as described above. The public/private divide associated with liberalism's principle of self-ownership and its extension to property rights in particular is problematised. The idea of "'A man's home is his castle"', very much an 'American tradition of constitutionalism', was a

[30] Kant was unwilling to go further on the issue of asylum and hospitality because he saw 'we, the civilised' (i.e. England) as abusing any right to visit. Though complicated, his position was anti-colonial (Dasgupta and Butler 2010: 1:13; Nussbaum 1996: 136).

[31] Some theories on cosmopolitanism deal directly with the idea of asylum cities and states. See, for example, Jacques Derrida's *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* (2001).

rejection of government interference in the private, domestic sphere, property-wise and thought-wise (Nedelsky 1990: 162). Because women were understood as inhabiting the domestic sphere, this effectively secured women's exclusion from the public (and by extension, the political) sphere. This critique sets the stage for a more relational understanding of autonomy in that it questions the notion of the fully bounded individual and takes into account the social in its development. The second critique pits the poststructuralist notion of constituted subjectivity against a discovered subjectivity. It relates to the individualist critique because it rejects abstract, transcendent man as prediscursive, to be revealed as essentially the same everywhere, and assumes the notion of the constituted subject. As such, this critique favours a more relational conception of autonomy, but also a more intersubjective one that rejects a stable, unitary subjectivity. Some of these critiques consider the relationship of the other as the stranger within, challenge common conceptions of boundaries as both necessary and always transgressed, and especially important to this project, draw parallels between personal and international boundaries (Butler 2008: 16:08, 39:10; Kristeva and Roudiez 1993: 3-4). The third critique focuses on the ethnocentricity of Westernised notions of autonomy that have been universalised and fail to take into consideration non-Western theorisations of autonomy. This critique also brings to light universalism and representation issues in both theories and critiques of autonomy: who is speaking for whom?

In an attempt to recuperate autonomy and outline its role in feminist theory, I first examine Natalie Stoljar and Catriona Mackenzie's five accounts of autonomy from feminist perspectives. With some overlap, these accounts represent differing positions on what autonomy is and how valuing it is a necessary response to subjugation, and can provide further detail into how autonomy relates to cosmopolitanism. In determining that relation, I assess each account through the critiques listed above.

Symbolic

Symbolic accounts focus on the 'autonomous man' as an abstraction. More specifically, they focus on what that model represents, or symbolises, in societies that hold the autonomous man as 'a cultural character ideal' (Code 1991: Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 6; Nedelsky 1989: 8, 1990). Lorraine Code's work exemplifies this critique. She describes the autonomous man:

> … [a] self-sufficient, independent… self-realizing individual who directs his efforts towards maximizing his personal gains. His independence is under constant threat from other… individuals: hence, he devises rules to protect himself from intrusion. Talk of rights, rational self-interest, expedience, and efficiency permeates his moral, social, and

> political discourse. In short, there has been a gradual alignment of *autonomy* with *individualism*. (Code 1991: 78; Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 6-7)

The above brings two important points to light. The first is the 'alignment' or slippage of autonomy with liberal individualism. Autonomy is 'so closely tied to the liberal tradition that it is often treated as symbolising the very individualism' that feminist theorists dismiss as unrealistic and unnecessary (Nedelsky 1989: 10). It points to the difficulty that (mis)understanding reveals: this critique does not reject autonomy as simply a 'false liberal' notion—indeed, none of these critiques warrant the categorical rejection of autonomy—but concedes that a more realistic, rehabilitated form of autonomy not based on an abstraction is still necessary for self-determination

The second is the impact this representation has had on notions of citizenship in liberal societies (namely the US). It is easy to see how this model excludes women, whose lives in the domestic sphere have historically depended more on cooperation and collaboration than competition, which has been a valued characteristic of the ideal man in keeping with his lack of need for others, and in harmony with open market capitalism that liberalism often encourages. Mackenzie and Stoljar name three major effects it has had 'in practice': 1) it encourages substantive independence over interdependencies (such as care, trust, friendship, etc.); 2) the ideal is stripped down of distinguishing characteristics (meaning diversity and difference) to sameness in the name of (false) neutrality; and 3) relationships (personal or communal) that are based on cooperation and independence are seen as antithetical, as a threat to or compromise of autonomy (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 6).

The slippage that projects the autonomous man as atomistic, abstract, and in this account, self-sufficient is so ingrained in American notions of autonomy and what it means to be a good citizen that Nedelsky refers to it as the 'pathological conception of autonomy as boundaries against others' and Code as the 'perversion of autonomy' (Code 2000: 181; Nedelsky 1989: 10). The slippage continues with the autonomous man essentialising independence, self-sufficiency and by extension under US law, capitalism; the major impetus for the US gaining independence from England was not only taxation without representation, but the 'right' to the pursuit of financial gain unfettered by government interference.[32]

[32] The impact this ideal has had on US society has directly resulted in a common and historical mistrust of 'welfare' and public health programmes. They are viewed as government interference in the 'choice' that private health care and private insurance affords, and welfare ('the dole' in the UK) as encouraging

This account primarily uses the 'individualist' critique, though Code expressly describes her contention with 'sedimented Kantian-derived conceptions of unified subjectivity' as prompted by postmodern notions of the decentred subject (Code 2000: 182). The value of the symbolic critique is threefold: 1) it identifies the roots of the autonomous man in liberal society that set up 'him' up as the ideal citizen; 2) having done so, it outlines the impact this ideal has on everyday life; and 3) it sets the stage for constructing a more relational and intersubjective autonomy.

Note that it does not attempt the reformulation. It only delineates the problem of the abstraction and assesses its impact. However, it is important to any reconceptualisation of autonomy for cosmopolitanism because is reveals the fallacy of liberal 'individualism'. Individualism is key to Pogge's first tenet of cosmopolitanism, but it is based on the false ideal of the atomistic individual; I suggest that whilst the individual remains key to cosmopolitanism, individualism needs redefining based on a more relational and intersubjective understanding of the individual.

Metaphysical

Metaphysical accounts of autonomy are heavily entrenched yet frequently problematised in feminist theory. They hinge on varying definitions of individualism, with autonomy dependent on all of them. As Mackenzie and Stoljar point out, many theorists, feminist and others, believe 'the agent to be socially embedded' and at least partially socially constituted (2000b: 7). The claim is that attributing autonomy to agents presupposes atomism, which would constitute a contradiction unless one entirely rejects autonomy. Metaphysical critiques do illustrate some of the false assumptions of liberal individualism, but their conclusions do not allow for a recuperated autonomy. What we can best learn from metaphysical critiques is to differentiate between 'individual autonomy' and 'individualistic conceptions of individual autonomy'—a slippage already noted in other accounts (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 8). Abstracting individuals from social contexts fails to understand the self constituted through social relations, including the generally accepted theories of Freud, amongst others (Braidotti 2006: 28; Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 10-11). Metaphysical accounts of autonomy are subject to the first critique as they assume some form of atomistic individualism.

---

slackers, despite high unemployment rates. Although 'more government' versus 'less government' has always defined the two political parties in the most fundamental way, rarely has it been as apparent as in 2010, where no Republican senators were willing to vote for any kind of health care reform, and again after the Affordable Care Act was enacted, which Republicans have repeatedly tried to repeal despite its constitutionality upheld by the US Supreme Court in 2012.

Care

Care accounts of autonomy are premised on conventional interpretations of autonomy being 'normatively flawed' rather than distorted or perverted by masculinist conceptions (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 9). Ethics of care value nurturance and caregiver relationships; thus, care critiques posit that individual autonomy can and should be nurtured through these relationships. In particular, Nancy Chodorow's theories on psychic development, identity formation and gendered processes of individuation have been influential, as have Carol Gilligan's theories on gendered moral development (Gilligan 1982; Dodds 2000: 221). In short, 'masculine psychic individuation and separation are conflated with separation from the mother', whereas the process for girls involves identifying with the mother and with connectedness, caregiving and interdependence. The result is gendered individual autonomy, where a sense of autonomy for men is self-sufficient independence. For women, psychic rather than substantive autonomy is the result, often at the expense of 'a strong sense of self' (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 9). Some theorists reject autonomy by conflating it with substantive independence, though more favour a reconceptualisation of autonomy that is not defined in opposition to female identity (as per Chodorow) and associated values of interconnectedness and care. These theorists, such as Nedelsky and Chodorow, advocate giving 'normative primacy' to care relationships, the mother-child relationship being the model for how relationships actually enable autonomy (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 9-10; Nedelsky 1989: 9, 12).

Ethics of care accounts of autonomy fall under the 'individualist' critique. Some, such as Nedelsky's, overlap with symbolic accounts in that they reject the liberal ideal of the autonomous man, albeit for different reasons. Whilst symbolic critiques point to the liberal state as the production site of that ideal, Chodorow and others look to psychic identity formation. Though Chodorow's work is qualified by being limited to gender-unequal societies with women as primary caregivers, there are few enough that fall outside of those limits that ethics of care critiques flirt with essentialism. The notion of agency is given short shrift and conceptualisations of selfhood seem limited (ibid.). In addition, reconceptualisations of autonomy are more or less vague; nevertheless, the prospect of a reformulated autonomy on these grounds feels decidedly gendered in outcome. At the same time, the centring of interdependencies and care relationships gives us alternative models to the autonomous man ideal:

> In this conception, the moral problem arises from conflicting responsibilities rather than from competing rights and requires for its resolution a mode of thinking that is contextual and narrative rather than formal and abstract. This conception of morality as concerned

> with the activity of care centers moral development around the understanding of responsibility and relationships, just as the conception of morality as fairness ties moral development to the understanding of rights and rules. (Gilligan in Kymlicka 2002: 400)

But ethics of care are not necessarily opposed to ethics of justice or morality. Care is framed as oppositional to reason, but as Marilyn Friedman maintains, '[t]he moralization of gender is more a matter of how we *think* we reason than how we actually reason, more a matter of the moral concerns we *attribute* to women and men than of true statistical differences women's and men's moral reasoning' (Friedman 1987: 96). Men and women's capacity for moral reasoning is not gendered, but what we are taught to prioritise most often is. If that is the case, then the problematic liberal notions of autonomy are not necessarily 'normatively flawed', but distorted and failing at the implementation of liberalism's promises, particularly when it comes to safeguarding the rights of women (Nussbaum 1998: 58-59).

Although useful in revealing interdependencies, the care/justice dichotomy is not only false, but as Friedman says, 'rationally implausible' and, in fact care and justice are 'conceptually complementary' (1987: 97). In US courts of justice, for example, juries must adhere to strict legal guidelines in determining a person's guilt or innocence. But in the sentencing phase, it is often the case that the defendant's special circumstances are taken into consideration. That directive is not simply an ethic of care or ethic of justice, but both. Rethinking ethics of care with ethics of justice works especially well for an intersubjective account of cosmopolitanism because justice and care do not need to be framed as oppositional. The individual is not set in opposition against the social, but is constituted by and through it. There is a mutuality in this understanding that is compatible with and complementary to cosmopolitanism.

Postmodern

The postmodern accounts of autonomy (often based on the Foucauldian theory of discourse and *subjectivation)*, is an umbrella category that rejects the autonomous man as an Enlightenment conceit (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 10-11). Many adhere to the Freudian psychoanalytic and poststructuralist belief that there is no discrete self and no unitary subjectivity contained independently of its surroundings (Braidotti 2006: 28; Butler 2008; Kristeva 1991: 181-192). Butler maintains that because boundaries are created through differentiation from others, there is an undeniable and necessary relationship there in that we are 'bound up' with others (Butler 2008: 13:00). Because the autonomous man is based on an atomistic, stable subjectivity, postmodern critiques sometimes categorically dismiss autonomy as part of the illusion of psychic unity.

This account also encompasses the liberal universalisation of the Western ideal of the autonomous individual when, in fact, autonomy is 'historically, socially and culturally specific' (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 11). Likewise, agency is seen 'as an effect of the complex and shifting configurations of power' rather than of individual will (2000b: 10). Not all postmodern theorists reject autonomy and many advocate a conception of autonomy that is refigured as intersubjective. There is some overlap with care critiques because of the emphasis on relationality and sociality. Nedelsky points out the paradox of autonomy on the social:

> We come into being in a social context that is literally constitutive of us. Some of our most essential characteristics, such as our capacity for language and the conceptual framework through which we see the world, are not made by us, but given to us (or developed in us) through our interactions with others (Nedelsky 1989: 8).

Nedelsky's ideas are infused with an ethic of care, but like Butler, she also specifically rejects the individual/collective opposition on subjectivity grounds, although she acknowledges there is sometimes conflict. She posits that '[w]e need a new conception of the tension between the collective and the individual, for which boundary is not an apt metaphor' (Nedelsky 1990: 162). It is a repudiation of the 'self-made man' paradigm, the man who seems not to have parents or other family members (usually women) who nurtured and raised him and who instilled a moral compass of one kind or another. It is always others who socialise the development of the individual and allow autonomy to emerge (Friedman 2000: 39-40). Unlike care ethics, the postmodern account does not emphasise any particular family relationships as models for the development of autonomy, but societies in general as constituting it.

This account has been useful in revealing problems in both normative conceptions of autonomy and their critiques. For example, it is critical of Chodorow's cross-cultural theory of mothering that 'fails to analyze the specific content in any given society at a specific point in time' (Best and Kellner 1991: 209). Because its premise is the socially constituted subject, it exemplifies the 'constituted subjectivity versus discovered subjectivity' critique. This account, above all others, focuses on the link between autonomy and subjectivity and therefore is most promising in its understanding of the individual as formed through intersubjectivity. In terms of it sounding the death knell for autonomy, postmodern conceptions of autonomy sometimes mistakenly conflate autonomy with an agency that requires psychic unity; hence, those conceptions are critical of autonomy, but require clarification in their treatment of agency (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 11).

Diversity

Diversity accounts also reject the unified subject. They emphasise the 'multiple identity' of each individual, the result of intersections of other social experiences and conditions (such as race and class) (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 11-12). The idea of multiple identities raises the notion of a fractured rather than integrated subject that may imply an incompatibility with autonomy. But the concept of the individual having multiple identities is rarely denied in theoretical debates today. Although cosmopolitan theorists recognise the multiplicity of people's identities, these intersections do not prevent the integration of those identities into a coherent self; there is nothing about multiple identities that absolutely negates autonomy or agency.[33] Indeed, it is questionable as to whether such integration is required for individual autonomy. I suggest a mutable sense of self is more the norm than not, and that the rejection of stable subjectivity is based on the fact that identities change over time. This is a highly cosmopolitan notion, as changing identities are so often the result of encountering and incorporating difference, and rejecting identities that no longer fit or work.

There is considerable overlap between these five accounts. Mackenzie and Stoljar's categorisations of autonomy represent only one taxonomy and it is not entirely unproblematic. However, the accounts are useful for comparison and for revealing various aspects of autonomy from a feminist perspective. In relation to a redevelopment of autonomy for cosmopolitanism, the symbolic account is useful for its characterisation of the autonomous man, linking it to its roots in liberalism and thus exposing its erroneous and damaging conflation with individualism. Metaphysical accounts are best used as an example of the slippage between 'individual' and 'individualistic'; their actual conceptions of individualism and their failure to consider the socially constituted subject render them otherwise inadequate. For cosmopolitanism's needs, care critiques' alternative understanding of the autonomy's gendered development, and provision of feminist models of interconnectedness may be their best utilisation (Dodds 2000: 220-221). Postmodern accounts are perhaps the most influential in recuperating autonomy as

[33] Similarly, the communitarian critique is critical of individual autonomy because it stands in opposition to 'the constitutionally social self', irrevocably tied to community through social attachments that are discovered, not chosen (Barclay 2000: 62-65). It is tied to the individual versus group rights question, one of the main issues in liberalism, as reflected in communitarian/cosmopolitan debates (Saharso 2000: 229-230). In *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (1996), Michael Sandel gives a more in-depth argument that disputes critical reflection of desires that seemingly only come from within. Without getting into those very involved debates, I will say that 1) cosmopolitanism is linked to community, but does not privilege it; and 2) communitarianism's privileging of group over individual rights is not compatible with individual difference, and thus not compatible with cosmopolitanism.

they rely on theories of intersubjectivity that bring into question autonomy's contingency and embeddedness. Diversity accounts rightly highlight the importance of difference and the multiplicities of identities most people have, but appear to be sidetracked by the red herring of identity integration and psychic unity.

Individualism

For critical cosmopolitanism, the nature of the socially constituted subject is at least *relationally autonomous*. Autonomy, as conceived here, is relational and dependent on the social. The problem is the liberal conception of individualism notion, which must be rejected as false and antithetical to cosmopolitanism. Simply stated, the charge is that the concepts of autonomy and individualism are inherently masculinist and inextricably bound up with masculine character ideals, with assumptions about selfhood and agency that are metaphysically, epistemologically, and ethically problematic from a feminist perspective, and with political traditions that historically have been hostile to women's interests and freedom. What lies at the heart of these charges is the conviction that the notion of individual autonomy is fundamentally individualist and rationalistic.

The charge of individualism is possibly the most damaging in current debates on the importance of autonomy to both feminist and cosmopolitan theories. In Western liberalism, individualism denotes the right to be free of government interference and in particular the right to unfettered pursuit of financial gain. Individualism and fear of state intrusion are deeply entwined in the political history of the US. From the time of New World colonisation by European religious exiles, the US political tradition has expressed a fear of state and social interference in business and private concerns. That interference is perceived as a threat to the individual's autonomy and is reflected in the Federalist Papers, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, all founding documents of the republic. We can see that all three autonomy critiques apply. This interpretation of individualism is an extension of the abstract, atomistic man: although this atomistic model is supposedly self-sufficient, it is not gender neutral and relies on the public/private sphere separation with the oblique aim of excluding the (female) caregivers who make that (false) self-sufficiency possible. The abstraction presumes a prediscursive, unitary subjectivity. Postmodern theorists arrived at the concept of fragmented, unstable subjectivities directly in response to those untenable presumptions. And Western individualism is perhaps above all a liberal hegemonic presumption, a political concept tied to rights associated with capitalism. Freudian, communitarian and postmodern critiques make similar charges that the

concept of autonomy is an Enlightenment (and hence Western) legacy, and although assumptions of autonomy may provide the basis for individualism, the latter in comparison is more of an ideology (in the same sense that nationalism can be ideological) than a trait or value. Feminist theorists in particular frame individualism as a masculinised ideal because it is so contrary to the historically collaborative experiences of women. The illusory notion of the 'self-made man' belies the real making of the man: his family, home, and community.

However, Nedelsky reminds us that feminist rejection of liberal autonomy is ambivalent because liberalism generally ignores how relationships enable autonomy: 'The values we cherish have come to us embedded in a theory that denies us the reality we know: the centrality of relationships in constituting the self' (1989: 9). In the West, liberalism has provided the basis for the fight for equality. Liberal autonomy was the ground on which first and second wave Western feminists claimed and won equal rights to suffrage, citizenship, property rights and more. As such, and because individualism is probably the most common focus of feminist critiques of autonomy, the conflation of individualism with autonomy is conceivably more detrimental to women's rights than it may initially appear. Nedelsky advocates reconceiving autonomy in order to retain its liberatory functions whilst recognising its constitution and rejecting the 'pathology' of the isolated, independent man (1989: 9-12). She states that it is not isolation that enables a person's autonomy, 'but relationships—with parents, teachers, friends, loved ones—that provide the support and guidance necessary for the development and experience of autonomy' (1989: 12), and is especially critical of liberalism's 'self-made man' ideal:

> The notion of autonomy goes to the heart of liberalism and of the powerful, yet ambivalent, feminist rejection of liberalism. The now familiar critique by feminists and communitarians is that liberalism takes atomistic individuals as the basic units of political and legal theory and thus fails to recognize the inherently social nature of human beings. Part of the critique is directed at the liberal vision of human beings as self-made and self-making men… The critics rightly insist that, of course, people are not self-made. (Nedelsky 1989: 8)

It has been suggested that Rawls' original position relies on the transcendent assumption of the individual, where (in his theorisation) the veil of ignorance shields any particular interests or biases that one individual may have and another may not, with the goal of determining how human rights may be agreed upon and allowing justice truly to be blind (Benhabib 1992b: 157). Benhabib's oft-referenced critique of the Kohlberg/Gilligan debate on gendered morality observes that the moral reciprocity ('the capacity to take the standpoint of others') required for Rawls' theory of justice and the veil of ignorance is incoherent: '*the other as different from the self,* disappears', becomes generalised and thus impossible abstraction, incapable of

individuation (1992b: 161). The other, rather than being real and concrete, is an 'androcentric phantasm' (Meyers 2000b: 152). Benhabib is in agreement with Appiah's stranger always being specific. Rawls' other and self appear to be based on Kant's noumenal self and are subject to the same critique. In Benhabib's interpretation, this means women are the generalised and never the concrete. She states that for 'universalistic, contractarian theories from Hobbes to Rawls', moral autonomy serves to privatise women's experience and exclude them from the moral point of view:

> In this tradition, the moral self is viewed as a *disembedded* and *disembodied* being. This conception of the self reflects aspects of male experience; the "relevant other" in this theory is never the sister but always the brother. This vision of the self… is incompatible with the very criteria of reversibility and universalizabilty advocated by defenders of universalism. A universalistic moral theory restricted to the standpoint of the "generalized other' falls into epistemic incoherencies that jeopardize its claim to adequately fulfil reversibility and universalizabilty. (Benhabib 1992b: 152)

Rawls' model is interpreted here as the masculinised antithesis of women in the private sphere, where productivity is dependent more on collaboration than competition. Indeed, for all the 'differences' Rawls mentions in *Theories of Justice* (1971), gender is not one of them. On the one hand, women and others are seemingly excluded from this model of individual autonomy. On the other, it appears that Rawls' just society assumes that there are caregivers in the private sphere where women are fully depended upon for the success of the men for whom the model was intended. Therefore, the original position appears to be a universalist interpretation of difference that further exemplifies feminist theorists' concerns over the atomistic model that presumes to neutralise difference but seems instead to ignore its existence. As critics of the social contract such as Benhabib posit, it is an implausible ideal because one can never remove the situatedness of the individual. There simply is no true, stripped down model of the individual that is devoid of difference, because such a model will never be true for everyone.

Whilst Benhabib's critique is beneficial in bringing to light the problematic atomism in Rawls contract theory, as a major example of the individualistic, universalising liberal theorist Rawls may be rather misunderstood, or at least too easily dismissed. Feminist theorists often 'point to his original position as a paradigm of justice-thinking', but the exact implications of his theory of justice on individualism continue to be heavily debated (Kymlicka 2002: 408). Indeed, he had a certain ambivalence regarding autonomy. Unlike most liberal theorists, Rawls was 'reluctant to explicitly endorse autonomy as a general human interest' because it seemed 'sectarian' to him, and in this sense was not universalist; furthermore, he understood that autonomy 'cannot exist

outside a social environment that provides meaningful choices and that supports the development of the capacity to choose amongst them' (Rawls 1987: 6, 24 in Kymlicka 2002: 243, 245).[34] And it can be argued that his veil of ignorance, however framed as aspiring to blind impartiality, is more importantly the attempt to imagine oneself in someone else's shoes, so to speak. It is not necessarily simply cold, abstract justice, but requires some sense of care and concern for others. What this points to again is the need to explore a realistic reformulation of autonomy and the relationality of the individual. Are liberalism's other aspects independent of that single notion of individualism or do we dismiss liberalism altogether?

Procedural vs. substantive debate

Part of the current reformulation of autonomy has involved breaking down autonomy into procedural and substantive accounts. Friedman describes procedural as 'personal autonomy… realized by the right sort of reflective self-understanding or internal coherence along with an absence of undue coercion or manipulation by others' (Friedman 2000: 40). This form of autonomy is content-neutral, without substantive values. It is a thin concept, which allows for particular and local ideas of autonomy. Its appeal to feminist theorists has been in its avoidance of the substantive account of the atomistic, masculinised model, or any other potentially exclusionary normative or hegemonic conception of the term (ibid.). Content-neutral means that 'the *content* of a person's desires, values, beliefs, and emotional attitudes' is irrelevant to the larger argument of 'motivational structure and the actions that flow from them' (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 13). The substantive account rejects content neutrality, and breaks down into weak ('further necessary conditions' on the constraints of those desires and preferences) and strong ('requiring specific content'). Both are relational and 'presuppose a richer account of agency than do procedural accounts' of autonomy (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000b: 13, 19, 21).

[34] ''The autonomy-based defence of individual rights invokes 'ideals and values that are not generally… shared in a democratic society', and hence 'cannot secure sufficient agreement'' (Rawls 1987: 6, 24 in Kymlicka 2002: 243). This was Rawls 'political liberalism', an attempt to accommodate conceptions of the good in non-liberal societies. The protections for the individual are the same, but his concern is the process, in contrast to Mill's comprehensive liberalism. It is not always recognised that Rawls shares certain fears of the imposition of norms onto societies other than 'ours' (whoever we are) with many critical theorists. Still, Kymlicka maintains that his attempt fails because 'it does not satisfy the demands of non-liberal societies' who want 'internal restrictions [to] take precedence over individual rights' (2002: 244). Following his line of reasoning, for those who prioritise individual rights (including cosmopolitan theorists), the substantive accounts of autonomy are preferable.

The procedural account's appeal has been that it is content-neutral and non-prescriptive, thus theoretically less hegemonic and absent of the abstract, masculinised model, and open to relationality and particularity. However, this account presents problems in several areas: the question of what protection it can offer women in a rights-based context, particularly regarding coercive social forces; its lack of full accounting for relationality and social constitution despite the potential; and the requirement of agency for autonomy. This last point is arguable for some feminists, but necessary to cosmopolitanism.

The majority of cosmopolitan theorists and certainly all normative theorists subscribe to the strong substantive account: the debate there is on the content. Nussbaum's Capabilities Approach, which seeks to enhance quality of life by establishing baseline criteria for 'functioning capabilities', is fairly material in its specifications: bodily health, bodily integrity, life, affiliation (choosing with whom to live), political and material control over one's environment (Nussbaum 2000: 78-80). She maintains that these functions are necessary for living a dignified, self-determined life. Though encompassing more than autonomy, it is highly substantive and for many cosmopolitan theorists, of questionable value simply because it is so prescriptive in its universalisms, and for critical (and some normative) cosmopolitan theorists too much so. However, it is difficult to find a self-identified cosmopolitan theorist who accepts only procedural accounts of autonomy, primarily because of the difficulty in incorporating useful individual rights. Saba Mahmood theorises that 'the cosmopolitan preference for substantive accounts of autonomy' has to do with individual rights in the form of negative and positive freedoms and agency (2005: 12).

> To be free 'from' something involves no action, will or choice—it is the absence of obstacles, and thus appears not to involve agency. The more contentious positive freedoms, the freedom 'to' self-determine, however, necessarily involve another form of agency—the capacity, normatively for 'self-mastery and self-government... In the west (particularly in the US) both positive and negative freedoms have played key roles in feminist liberatory theory, through self-determination and the opportunity to choose to take certain actions previously prohibited to women (such as voting), and through the right to be free from oppression and coercion by having independence from those using such force. (Mahmood 2005: 11-12)

Agency

The value of autonomy will at some level be inseparable from the relations that make it possible; there will thus be a social component built into the meaning of autonomy. That is the difference. But the presence of a social component does not mean that the value cannot be threatened by collective choices; hence the continuing need to identify autonomy as a separate value, to take

account of its vulnerability to democratic decision-making, and to find some way of making those decisions "accountable" to the value of autonomy. (Nedelsky 1989: 36)

The debate on agency need not preclude a more relational autonomy, though it highlights the role of particularity in its conceptions. Independence *per se* is not morally valuable as it can be used positively or negatively; nonetheless, it would seem to be necessary for self-determination. The question, then, would be how a particular society values self-determination, however conceived. Many societies have strict norms as to which consenting adults, for example, can enter into an intimate relationship with which other consenting adults. Most feminist theorists would agree that even within those societies that value community over the individual, individuals should be allowed to make those decisions themselves *if they choose to*. Negatively, one could say that individuals should not be legally prohibited from engaging in intimate and/or sexual acts with other consenting adults. And if they do choose to make that decision against the norms of their community and family, is it not some sense of autonomy and agency or self-determination that the decision is based upon? In fact, the choice to live harmoniously within the norms of one's habitus is also just that: a choice that requires some form of autonomy—as long as it is a choice that is recognisable on some level. However agency is conceived, most feminist theorists agree that like autonomy, agency is not a value or ability that exists in identical form outside the collective (O'Neill 2000: 29). It is something that is enabled socially, which indicates particularity. Kathryn Abrams concurs:

> The socialization that liberals view as hindering autonomy is sufficiently complex and pervasive that it cannot simply be transcended. Agency must operate within and in relation to this socialization. Self-definition does not occur through a process of excavating the pre-social self or disentangling oneself from social influences. (Abrams 1998-1999: 825)

Abrams maintains that the liberal conception of agency fails sufficiently to acknowledge the impact of the social, and theorises 'feminist agency' with 'a political dimension to this process of recognizing and reflecting on the influence of social norms… They are a product of, and a means by which, women's oppression is perpetuated in particular settings' (1998-1999: 826-827). Abrams links agentic autonomy to resistance, a controversial move despite its popularity in the West. It is not resistance to individual interference she is most concerned about, but 'group-based attempts at disempowerment' (1998-1999: 821). As with many human rights campaigns, it is group coercion against minority groups (in Abrams' context, women) or against individuals (such as sexual dissidents) that makes the resistance/autonomy/agency links so important.

The relationship between agency and autonomy is also a controversial one in the debates on the issue of women's instrumentality in their own oppression, as Mahmood discusses at length in *Politics of Piety,* which focuses on Islamic women involved in the piety movement (Mahmood 2005). Mahmood looks at the suturing of resistance, autonomy, and subordination in the women's mosque movement groups, where the piety movement is strong. Taking up the first 'individualism' and third 'western-centric' critiques, she argues that feminist theorists 'locate agency in the political and moral autonomy of the subject' and that the prevalent conceptions of negative and positive freedoms are Western norms (2005: 7, 10-11). She associates the latter with liberal notions of 'universal reason or self-interest'. Mahmood notes that self-realisation is not a Western concept, but that liberalism links it with individual autonomy and thus 'the process of realizing oneself is equated with the ability to realize the desires of one's 'true will' (Gray 1991)' (Mahmood 2005: 11). Like Friedman, she describes 'procedural' versus 'content' principles of autonomy, but claims that these are 'liberal presuppositions… that have become naturalized' in feminist theory (2005: 13). It is necessary to take agency in context:

> [a]gency, in this form of analysis, is understood as the capacity to realize one's own interests against the weight of custom, tradition, transcendental will, or other obstacles (whether individual or collective). Thus the humanist desire for autonomy and self-expression constitutes the substrate, the slumbering ember that can spark to flame in the form of an act of resistance when conditions permit. (Mahmood 2005: 8)

Within most (usually normative) cosmopolitan debates, what Mahmood describes as agency would be one definition of autonomy, which she attributes to liberalism's linking of 'the notion of self-realization with individual autonomy' (2005:11). She acknowledges that the concept of individual autonomy is key to both negative and positive freedoms, and it is procedural autonomy on which these freedoms depend. Because feminism is liberatory, transformative politics, it can be prescriptive as well as analytic; however, 'freedom' is normative, so the result is often an elision of other accounts of autonomy (2005: 9-11). Whilst some are in favour of the procedural account precisely because it is less prescriptive, hence theoretically less hegemonic, Mahmood questions the entire construction of agency as belonging to the individual, and therefore agency's attachment to autonomy:

> It is often presumed that to speak about ethical self-formation necessarily requires a self-conscious agent who constitutes herself in a quasi-Promethean manner, enacting her will and hence asserting "her own agency" against structural forces. This presumption is incorrect on a number of scores. Even though I focus on the practices of mosque participants, this does not mean that their activities and the operations they perform on themselves are products of their independent wills; rather, my argument is that these

> activities are the products of authoritative discursive traditions whose logic and power far exceeds the consciousness of the subjects they enable. The kind of agency I am exploring here does not belong to the women themselves, but is a product of the historically contingent discursive traditions in which they are located. (Mahmood 2005: 32)

According to most liberal and feminist thought, an account demonstrating that desire is free from coercive subordination or domination is needed to prove that agency is necessary for freedom (O'Neill 2000: 33-34; Linden 1998: 215). Like Abrams, Mahmood argues against an agency that originates solely in the individual but de-links resistance from agency and autonomy. She attempts to uncouple (feminist) progressive politics (including poststructuralist feminist theory) from agency-as-self-determination in favour of situated agencies 'that not only resist norms, but also in the multiple ways in which one inhabits norms' (Mahmood 2005: 14-15, 20-22). She points out that the desire to be free of or to subvert norms is not innate or universal. It is discursive, so agency is never fixed in advance.

Mahmood's account of autonomy and agency contradicts Nedelsky's (amongst others') account of autonomy, particularly the importance of 'feeling' or 'experiencing' autonomy, which Nedelsky believes is entirely necessary or else we lose the capacity for it (Nedelsky 1989: 23-26).[35] In addition, the recognition of feelings 'defines as authoritative the voices of those whose autonomy is at issue' (1989: 25). In other words, giving voice is an exercise of power and validation. In light of Mahmood's observation of different forms of agency, co-existing or not with autonomous will, the capacity for those feelings may not be integral to agency or autonomy in non-western contexts at all. 'Powerlessness' as a feeling is discursively produced—one may know that one is powerless, yet experience some form of freedom. However, one may feel powerful in prison because of special rights granted, but in actuality it is others who are exercising their power over the prisoner, who does not have the power or autonomous agency to shut them out. As Nedelsky puts it, 'Playing someone else's game well is not defining the path of one's own life' (Nedelsky 1989: 24).

[35] Nedelsky claims that 'powerlessness is destructive of autonomy', which is how it is conceived in Western discourse. She states that autonomy is elusive because 'it is practically inseparable from an experience or feeling' with the later qualification that '[i]t would, of course, seriously distort any political analysis of autonomy to treat it as a 'mere' feeling. One can evaluate the degree of autonomy an individual is actually capable of exercising, and there can be disparities between experience and reality' (Nedelsky 1989: 23). Although one may feel powerful, one may in actuality not be. Still, '[a]utonomy is a capacity, but it is unimaginable in the absence of the feeling or experience of being autonomous' (Nedelsky 1989: 24).

Mahmood has faced charges that she has de-politicised agency and resistance, a point for which I have some sympathy. Mahmood responds:

> … the self is socially and discursively produced, an effect of operations of power rather than the progenitor of these operations. As such, an inquiry into the constitution of the self does not take the personal preferences and proclivities of the individual to be the object of study, but instead analyzes the historically contingent arrangements of power through which the normative subject is produced. I have found this framework particularly powerful insomuch as it helps denaturalize the normative subject of liberal feminist theory thereby making it possible to approach the lives of the mosque participants in ways not determined by the truths this body of scholarship asserts as universal. (Mahmood 2005: 33)

She takes a common Foucauldian approach to her study of the mosque women and her aim to 'denaturalize the normative subject' is well taken. Her intention is precisely to take agency out of its normative political formulation because that formulation has been so deceptively culturally conceived, and then taken up as if it were neutral. She asks, 'How does a particular conception of the self require and presuppose different kinds of political commitments?' (ibid.). It is a tremendously valuable question, but does it leave contradictory her exposition that agency and resistance cannot be understood outside their cultural contexts, and the incidence of global resistance that, whilst collectively constituted, nonetheless bears remarkable similitude? The plight of sexual dissidents and their forms of resistance worldwide have enough commonalities to frame them as persecutions deserving of human rights status. Mahmood has revealed the underpinnings of our common understandings of autonomy, agency, and resistance, but they must not be left de-politicised. Whilst agreeing with her theorisations of how agency can be located and cultivated through 'historically contingent discursive traditions' (above), I am left wondering how any one individual in the group feels about her capacities to leave, or to change her surroundings.

It is an empirical observation that from virtually every corner of the world, regardless of political climate, government, religious environment, ethnicity, or nationality, a lack of tolerance for same-sex sex has resulted in persecution, imprisonment, or death. The concern for these individuals, in effect, is extreme particularism. It falls under the purview of individual human rights; although a community or group may not value individual autonomy or agency, and although its members are surely embedded and situated, we nonetheless see myriad examples of those individuals desperate to change, or be protected, or leave.

There are countless instances of individuals, particularly sexual dissidents, from numerous countries who have required changing or leaving their surroundings for survival. As noted earlier

in the chapter, the torture and executions of MSM in a number of different countries shows the necessity of the individual's right to exit. There exists an 'underground railroad' that funnels gay men escaping Iran to Turkey, where they live in limbo, waiting for asylum to be granted from a country where homosexuality is not illegal (Faiola 2010). In late 2009, two Malawi men held a traditional engagement celebration in public and were subsequently arrested. They were jailed with no bond for several months and faced 14 years of imprisonment before international pressure led to their release (Cohen 2010). Conversely, women's plights may not seem as overtly urgent, but they may have less of an opportunity to move. Many homosexual couples want to marry in countries where homosexuality is illegal and/or subject to severe punishment, yet do carry out their own non-state sanctioned ceremonies. Those people are as much at risk as the Malawi couple. I have yet to learn of a culture or society where there are no women who have sex with women, nor MSM. The social construction of 'homosexuality' may vary enormously between cultures, as does the construction of heterosexuality, but the fact remains: the desire to escape worldwide persecution of homosexuality exists everywhere (though by no means do I want to imply that every persecuted person wants to leave), and without some form of autonomy or agency, there would seem to be no chance for exit, and no chance for survival with one's partner. Mahmood does not mention if she knew of same-sex relationships in the piety group she studied. If she did, one may wonder if they were content to keep their relationships hidden. There are many questions that can be asked of such situations, and whilst I situate myself within a US/UK perspective, I have met countless men and women from dozens of countries that persecute homosexuals who, without a sense of autonomy and agency, would stay oppressed at best in their home countries. The desire to live, without persecution, with one's same-sex partner is as common around the world as marriage, and perhaps just as differentiated—but that does not preclude the desire of so many to live openly. There is a difference between autonomous will and agency, particularly if one considers self-determining action as part of agency. I maintain that for cosmopolitanism, some (particular) forms of both are necessary for individual rights. Whilst agency, autonomy and resistance are stand-alone concepts that are particular, relational, and unfixed, I agree with Abrams on the necessity to link them when required.

Sawitri Saharso gives another account of relational autonomy agency that also argues against its liberal conceptions, which she interprets as centring on people's freedom to assess and have the capacity to determine the conditions of their existence (Saharso 2000: 228; see also Meyers 2000b: 158-9, 162-3). Saharso notes Clifford Geerzt's observation that the Western understanding of the person as a bounded, unique individual is a strange one in many other

locales (Saharso 2000: 231). Her answer to these notions of autonomy that problematise its apparent lack in some other cultures is *intrapsychic* autonomy (2000: 235). Intrapsychic autonomy is 'the ability to maintain enduring mental representations of sources of self-esteem and comfort, permitting a more flexible adaptation to the vicissitudes of the immediate environment' (ibid.).[36] Saharso wants to account for 'how people are capable of acting as socially constituted yet autonomous individuals… [S]ome people may have no conscious understanding of themselves as individuals whilst still having developed (some) individuality' (2000: 232). She subscribes to Katherine Ewing's hypothesis that intrapsychic autonomy is necessary for survival when 'interpersonal' autonomy is low, providing 'psychological resilience' and 'the ability to maintain a conscious awareness of one's inner thoughts and feelings when these differ from one's overt actions and may be socially unacceptable' (Saharso 2000: 236-237). This interpretation would account for South Asian women's lower degree of individuation in general. Saharso explains how these two types of autonomy work in the family and in women's relationships to their community, but does not elaborate on if and how this might make for a more collaborative society.

After defining 'intrapsychic' autonomy, Saharso attempts to move the autonomy debate forward with the assertion that 'we cannot take proper account of the impact of cultural practices on autonomy until we broaden our understanding of autonomy to include these basic [psychological] preconditions' (2000: 230). She is specific that the preconditions she speaks of are neither material nor a matter of ignorance (2000: 231). In 'Feminist Ethics, Autonomy and the Politics of Multiculturalism', Saharso posits that the focus on the voluntary/coercion binary glosses over the complexities and nuances of different contexts (autonomy in families, in society, in relation to self) (Saharso 2003). She advocates a relational approach 'that treats social relationships and human community as central to the achievement of autonomy' that emphasises social embeddedness, and the intersectionality of social determinants 'such as class, gender and ethnicity' (2003: 201). Saharso's version of relational autonomy does not fit liberal ideas of autonomy in total, but is not antithetical to it, either. It appears to be a more nuanced, socialised version of autonomy that provides a middle ground between liberal political notions of autonomy, and variations in psychoanalytic conceptualisations of it. Her account gives credence to an inner autonomy that is compatible with O'Neill's inherent autonomy, but can also be theorised as a coping mechanism to counter the inability to self-determine action.

[36] See Ewing, Katherine. 1991. 'Can Psychoanalytic Theories Explain the Pakistani Woman? Intrapsychic Autonomy and Interpersonal Engagement in the Extended Family'. *Ethos* 19 (2):131-160.

In a related delinking of autonomy and agency, Sumi Madhok criticises what she calls 'act atomism' in contemporary feminist accounts of autonomy (Madhok 2007: 343). She claims that an effect of the individualist conception of autonomy is the overemphasis on the 'ability to move freely' and action in general. Madhok describes how this conception does not work in contexts of subordination (2007: 335, 337). She agrees with Mahmood that agency needs to be de-linked from resistance. Both demonstrate that agency does not require action: one can 'have' agency, or use it, if called for. If one agrees with the norms of one's habitus, even if it involves subordination, no action is required for the existence of agency, or autonomy. But although agency is part of O'Neill's classic interpretation of the two normative conceptions of autonomy, there is nothing in the second description (a kind of 'coherence or rationality') that relies on action.[37]

The capacity for action is implied in the first, however, and O'Neill makes clear that it is situated. Like Mahmood, Madhok sees agency as not dependent on resistance. Nevertheless, this still leaves us with the question of how far away from the concept of autonomy we go before we get to the right to exit, to the ability to leave one's surroundings when necessary. Madhok's logic is correct in deducing that an effect of liberal autonomy's individualism is an overemphasis on action, but I am not sure that O'Neill requires the 'the ability to move freely' for her first definition. However, cosmopolitanism asserts that the ability to change surroundings in dire circumstances is an individual right. I do not see that as an artefact of individualism, but rather as a matter of human rights (see Chapter Four on the role of cosmopolitan universalism in human rights).

The theorists discussed in this chapter agree that autonomy, and agency, are relational to a greater or lesser degree. The meanings of these terms, though, are highly contentious. But regardless of how either is constituted, when action is required of the individual, *for* the individual, what do we call it if not agency or some form of autonomy? And is it possible that we, in the attempt to counter the hegemony of liberal individualism and the notion of the unified subject, universalise the situated subject and actually obliterate difference? It appears to me that often, in the attempt to recognise cultural particularity we sacrifice the ultimate particular: the individual, however socially constituted. Even as theorists put aside identity politics, the

[37] 1) A form of independence in acts and agents that is relational and graduated, that is *'from* something… and may be *more or less complete*.' or 2) a form of coherence or rationality in acts and (for some) agents and is not relational or graduated, but inherent (O'Neill: 2000: 29).

emphasis on group recognition remains, not only because gross inequalities between groups still exist in the world, but because of the exact reasons Mahmood, Saharso, Nedelsky, and others put forth. The atomised liberal version of the individual is without relationality, so we must acknowledge the collective if we wish for a more realistic understanding of the concept. But losing the individual in this process may mean that real people lose protection of their own particularity.

What of the woman in these groups who does want to resist traditional roles—the one who chooses to go against religion, tradition, and the social customs surrounding her? How have these women coped? She may be born into the group and constituted through those relations, but she is also different, perhaps because of the kind of intimate relationship she has or wants to pursue, or the kind of occupation she desires. We can acknowledge groups who conceptualise what some theorists might consider subordinate and contradictory forms of agency and autonomy, imagine different forms of subjectivity those conceptualisations might entail, and respect groups' rights to follow those (as) norms. We can theorise subjectivities so different that the sense of the self might barely be recognisable to Western eyes. But people are different from each other in an infinite number of ways. Friedman points out that if we are to take embodiment seriously, we need to recognise that we are physically distinct, each following 'our own (separately embodied) trajectory through space and time' (Friedman 2000:16). Every culture has ways of distinguishing one from another as surely as every culture uses language; it is not just how we are constituted through each other, but also how we discriminate one person from another. Is there a society of people all so subjectively the same that the individual does not exist, where 'I' always and only means 'we' regardless of the recognition of interdependence?

Both Saharso and Madhok resist making categorical statements about their different perceptions, but for progress to be made in these areas (autonomy, agency, universality), the recognition that people do experience autonomy and agency differently, legitimately, is necessary. Cosmopolitanism demands that individuals have the right, and the capacity, to change their surroundings if they are in dire need. For many, there are seemingly insurmountable challenges to exercising that right, at least as many as there are cultures. But it is the point of cosmopolitanism as a transformative social and political theory that at a basic level, when required for survival, the individual has the right to change their locale. How to move forward in that direction is arguable, but a relational understanding of autonomy can advance our understanding of those needs and the possible solutions. An intersubjective account that

recognises not just how sociality influences and enables but constitutes autonomy and agency is most compatible with cosmopolitanism.

Autonomy: relational, intersubjective

> Cosmopolitan morality… centers around the fundamental needs and interests of individual human beings, and of all human beings. (Pogge 1992: 58)

In this chapter, I have argued that the liberal, abstract version of autonomy that moral cosmopolitanism is associated with is unworkable, based as it is on the false premise of the abstract, atomistic man. Yet the many different theorisations of autonomy and agency examined here all conclude that both are relational to a greater or lesser degree. What feminist, postmodern and some liberal critiques of autonomy have revealed is that all autonomy is historically and geographically specified, always conceptualised through political and cultural frameworks, and always interpreted (Brydon 2004; Held 1995: 166).

I argue here that the feminist, less abstract understanding of autonomy is more compatible with a cosmopolitan theory that values difference and diversity and acknowledges the situatedness of the individual. The relationality and the importance of sociality in these different accounts of autonomy and agency are also, I argue, compatible with Pogge's idea of cosmopolitan concern for the individual, and for all individuals. The common liberal version of autonomy, whilst supportive of individual rights, must be untangled from its conflation with liberal individualism in order to expose its real contingency and exclusivity. Doing so allows theorists to recognise the relationality of cosmopolitanism without sacrificing the importance of individual rights.. Indeed, it is possible that many normative cosmopolitan theorists do not apprehend the possibilities that relationality and intersubjectivity can contribute to cosmopolitan theory.

A reconstructed cosmopolitanism will continue to be dependent on autonomy and agency. As a liberal cosmopolitan advocate of the global democracy project (an offshoot of normative cosmopolitanism), David Held maintains that regardless of the interpretation, democracy cannot be fully understood or realised without subscribing to the principle of autonomy, which in turn means little outside of its 'enactment' (Held 1995: 303-304). Diana Brydon describes the fullness and contingency of the term:

> Depending on how it is conceived, autonomy may signal the self-determination of the nation, the self-determination of stateless groups that seek to break up the nation in the name of their own autonomy, the neo-liberal individual who rejects all such notions of collectivity, the self-disciplined individual who is the subject of Foucault's biopower, or the

> utopian goal of collectively creating equitable and democratic forms of governance at local and/or global levels. (Brydon 2004: 2)

There are clearly different levels of abstraction to these notions of relational autonomy, and I have discussed the tensions that exist within the agreements on autonomy's relationality, particularly with non-western formulations. The key difference between liberal theorists' recognition of relationality and the critical theorists' conceptions that I find most useful to cosmopolitanism is best described by Abrams:

> … [V]irtually everyone is subject to formation by social norms, images, and practices. … [T]hese influences are multiple, specific to particular contexts, and capable of shaping and intersecting with each other in innumerable, unpredictable combinations. The variety and pervasiveness of these influences makes the question of distinguishing internal from external direction not simply difficult, but almost unintelligible. Moreover, this complex socialization operates in a field of power relations that has not been highlighted either by feminist liberal theorists or traditional liberal theorists of autonomy. This means that practices contributing to socialization may operate not simply on individuals, but on individuals as members of groups, and that reinterpreting and resisting these practices or socially-assigned meanings may be one way of exercising self-direction. This political context also suggests that the processes of self-definition and self-assertion that have been characterized as autonomy may be more collective than liberal theorists have suggested, both in their genesis and in the targets of their operation. (Abrams 1998-1999: 823)

Abrams' conceptualisation of relationality enabling autonomy is consistent with Nedelsky's juridical and rights-based perspective on autonomy. Nedelsky's focus is on how society *via* the state cultivates and nurtures autonomy, which she does not equate with independence (meaning not atomistic). 'Questions of definition, scope, and justification are inherent in all forms of rights claims. My argument is that the best way to reflect on those questions is to understand rights as means of structuring relationships' (Nedelsky 1993: 343). She describes her framework:

> [It] does not deny the value of autonomy, but it fundamentally recasts it in relational rather than individualistic terms: we will better understand autonomy claims when we understand autonomy itself as a capacity which can only thrive in the context of relationships that foster it. (Nedelsky 1993: 345-346).

Nedelsky's work is useful to cosmopolitanism because she challenges 'the focus on boundaries as the means of comprehending and securing the basic values of freedom and autonomy' in the US and rejects the notion of rights as limits as 'deeply flawed' (Nedelsky 1990: 162). The cosmopolitan concern for the rights and wellbeing of others in the form of obligation can be enhanced by taking up Nedelsky's theories on rights as relationships, arguing against the liberal notion that rights protect individuals from others as if through bounded spheres (rooted in

private property) rather than interaction (1989: 9; 1996: 455-461). She does not reject the term 'individual', but she uses 'individualistic' as meaning liberal individualism.

However, I interpret both Abrams and Nedelsky as not limiting their theories on subjectivity and autonomy to relationality. Both indicate a more intersubjective understanding of autonomy, where autonomy and agency are not only influenced and enabled by sociality, but also constituted by and through it. It is an intersubjective interpretation of the subject that retains the basic concept of the individual but rejects setting the individual in opposition to the collective the liberal self/other binary demands and that defines liberal 'individualism'.

Nedelsky's position on ethics of care, though perhaps a bit more nebulous in its potential application, can also be informative for cosmopolitanism. The ethics of care account of autonomy can contribute much to cosmopolitanism's concern for individuals by acknowledging the importance of collective nurturance. It is not entirely separate from her legal work on boundaries and relationships, but the aim is different. Care focuses more on personal development through the nurturance of family relationships and on emphasising the importance of the mother/child bond in particular. I find that emphasis somewhat problematic, as there seems to be evidence that the nurturance bond is more a matter of intimacy than gender. Despite its problems, care ethics' in-depth analyses of interdependencies are useful in theorising alternative, caring motivations for cosmopolitanism's positions on moral obligations to others. Friedman and others have pointed out that a justice ethic is not antithetical, and perhaps even complementary to care ethics. Thus, the cosmopolitan attachment to liberal notions of justice is not contrary to care; and provided that the concept of the individual is as unbounded and socially constituted, it is compatible with a critical cosmopolitanism.

Reconceiving autonomy and agency to fit a reconstructed cosmopolitan theory is important to its position on human rights. Abrams' and Nedelsky's positions, contrary to the liberal, bounded notions, seem to be most useful to cosmopolitan morality. Mahmood and others make important contributions to the project of reconceiving them by 'denaturalizing' human rights from their normative understandings, but tensions remain regarding de-linking them from resistance, a vital aspect to cosmopolitan human rights. Nonetheless, their work informs the development of those concepts within cosmopolitan theory.

Pogge's statement is unequivocal in acknowledging that all people are individual people, and all are equally worthy of having their fundamental needs met; indeed, the better off are obligated to

help the worse off. If we accept that position, our interrelations and interdependencies are obvious at the very least through our moral obligations. And whilst some (coercive) interrelationships may hinder autonomy, others are necessary (Brydon 2004: 3). Cosmopolitanism would do well to reject the individual/collective binary for the same reasons feminism rejects the atomistic, unencumbered man. Sociality is key to both.

Conclusion

> Might it not be necessary to do two things at once: to emphasize both the permanent value of the philosophy of rights, and, simultaneously, the inadequacy, the limits of the breakthrough it represented? (Cixous 1993: 18).

A relational, intersubjective understanding of autonomy is highly compatible with the cosmopolitan notion of the individual. Relationality is key to cosmopolitanism's emphasis on diversity, and lends itself well to the cosmopolitan notion of a global collectivity. These concepts are not contradictory to the notion of individual rights, which, at least for the time being, are necessary to protect the marginalised individual, the minority within either the majority or the minority. It can include O'Neill's 'inherent autonomy', but one that is agentic is necessary for the right to exit to be accessible.

Relationality and sociality open up productive avenues for cosmopolitanism. Though care ethics are not unproblematic, the prospect of incorporating certain aspects into cosmopolitanism's moral obligations to others is intriguing. Exploring Nedelsky's critiques of boundaries in relation to property rights and personal ownership can add to discourses on cosmopolitan rejection of national boundaries as barriers to human rights (Nedelsky 2003: 126). In addition, certain issues remain. Although different interpretations of relational autonomy provide challenges to exactly which terms and traits are most fitting for cosmopolitanism, the questions of agentic autonomy and resistance may be some of the most challenging to cosmopolitan positions on human rights.

Appiah makes the case that the fundamental argument for cosmopolitanism is the autonomy and human dignity that variety enables (Appiah 2005; 2006: 108). His 'other' is never generalised; his stranger is always a particular stranger (Appiah 2006: 98). Every individual is unlike any other, yet all are of equal moral worth and deserving of the same basic human rights. Thus, his idea of the individual is in a sense universal, but not abstract. His appreciation for the particular is, like Pogge's, unequivocal: we are all particular. Thus we have two concepts that both appear to be true: the individual who has rights that separate them (for lack of a better word) from

others in the form of protection, and the unbounded self who is constituted through and cannot live without others.

As Butler notes, rights claims are made ‘to someone else, to another, invoking a certain radical dependency of each on all’ (Butler 2008: 18:05). Intersubjectivity allows for that ‘radical dependency’, and it is key to this critical cosmopolitanism. The relations are still there, still necessary; we are both separate, and not.

Chapter Four Overview

This chapter continues the interrogation of cosmopolitanism's three structural components. In the previous chapter I examined cosmopolitanism's necessity for a relational conception of autonomy and argued against the frequent conflation of autonomy with liberal notions of individualism. There, I discussed how the abstract and transcendent model of the atomistic man is idealised in liberal conceptualisations of autonomy and universalised in liberal theory. As with autonomy, universalism is a key component of cosmopolitan theory that has been problematised by a number of theorists inside and outside that field. In this chapter, I build on those critiques of liberalism to interrogate issues that include the universalisation of the atomistic, transcendent model of the individual, as well as others. I discuss relevant debates on human rights, false neutralities and particularity, and the counter-charge of relativism aimed and critiques of univeralism, and the problems of detachment and 'reflective distance'.

I argue that universalism remains necessary to cosmopolitanism, including this critical cosmopolitan, but that it needs Arendt's claim of the universal human condition of plurality and the politicisation of universalism (through negotiation) in order to minimise universalism's tendency towards hegemony. I also use Zerilli, Butler, and Hutchings in assessing rights arguments, discourse ethics, and Arendt's plurality.

Chapter Four: Universalism

Introduction

Cosmopolitanism has repeatedly emerged at times when the world has suddenly seemed to expand in unassimilable ways; it is at these moments that universalism needs the rhetoric of worldliness that cosmopolitanism provides. (Anderson, A. 1998: 272; see also Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000: 578, 583)

In the previous chapter I linked Pogge's first tenet, *individualism*, to autonomy, arguing that it is necessary for critical cosmopolitanism but in need of reformulation. In this chapter, I focus on the second, cosmopolitan *universality*, and again argue for both its necessity and reformulation. I include here Pogge's third tenet, which gives the second tenet its scope, in this case meaning everyone.

- *Universality*: the status of ultimate unit of concern attaches to *every* living human being *equally*.

- *Generality*: this special status has global force. Persons are ultimate units of concern *for everyone* (1992 48-49).

Universalism is often presented as intrinsic to cosmopolitanism, sometimes to the point of conflation. In this context, universalism has two important suppositions. First, it presupposes that there exist certain *commonalities* in people that are true everywhere, all the time, just by virtue of being human. Second, these commonalities engender both *rights* and *obligations* for all humans. It bears repeating Kant's overarching declaration, 'The peoples of the earth have thus entered in varying degrees into a universal community, and it has developed to the point where a violation of rights in *one* part of the world is felt *everywhere'* ([1795] 1977a: 107-108). Kant envisioned cosmopolitanism as a global moral community where certain obligations were 'universal' to all, states and individuals alike. The notion that 'we' have obligations to others, regardless of identity or national borders, because we all have the same moral worth is the universalism upon which cosmopolitan justice was founded. These obligations often take the form of a universal ethic that includes human rights (Benhabib, Waldron et al. 2006: 1; Kleingeld 2000: 314). However, conceptions of universalism have varied through the millennia and continue to evolve today. Its definition can no longer be assumed, nor can its coverage: universalism does not necessarily denote everywhere, all the time, unless it is absolute. It

remains, though, that cosmopolitanism is so closely associated with liberal universalism that its theorists are sometimes simply considered 'universalists' (Hollinger 2001: 239; Mehta 2000: 622).

As such, the frequent conflation of universalism and cosmopolitanism is understandable, simply because what distinguishes cosmopolitan justice from any other kind of justice is its global scope. 'Global' implies universality; it provides the basis for Kant's dream of a perpetual peace; for the arguments for global distributive justice on which so many normative cosmopolitan theorists focus; and is the foundation of the argument for international human rights. Normative cosmopolitanism's emphasis on human rights is one of its most important attributes and whilst critical theorists debate their efficacy and costs, they still have widespread support given the protections they provide for so many people. Theoretically, it is in the universality of these rights that their efficacy lies. Their appeal is in what universalism claims to provide.

However, what is most appealing about universalism—its 'authority'—is also what is most problematic about it. Nedelsky notes that, despite our yearning for the stability that rights are claimed to offer, in reality, rights are always negotiated.

> We think that rights can only succeed in protecting us if there is something indisputable, or at least peremptory, about claims made in their name. That is, I think, part of the urge to insist on universal rights. If rights are not universal, then there is always room for dispute, for debate over whether they apply in a given situation. And when we claim a right, we do not want to invite debate. We want the claim treated as authoritative, with unassailable moral authority behind it... Indeed, we want some things to be particularly resistant to debate because we want them to be the most stable dimension of our society. Rights claims are supposed to provide this resistance on behalf of basic values. But the reality… is that rights claims are disputed. That is what the courts do: they arbitrate disputes over rights. (Nedelsky 1996: 482-483)

We resist inviting debate on universal rights because it weakens what compels us to depend on them. This can be true even when they do not serve us well—it is easier to tolerate oppression when one has been convinced that there is a higher authority behind it. This resistance hampers negotiation and it is the primary reason many non-normative theorists believe that all universal rights require constant critique. They require a kind of continuous politicisation in order to make them transparent, reveal their rooted particularities and reevaluate their implications on a regular basis, and in doing so resist their tendencies towards hegemonic norms.

Challenges

Beyond an agreement that the universality of some rights and obligations are key to accommodating cosmopolitanism's global scope, debates within cosmopolitan theory centre on what constraints universalism might face, and how these constraints work with and define notions of global justice. As with autonomy, liberal notions of the concept tend to presuppose a false neutrality formulated through the social reality particular from which it emerged (Mehta 2000: 622). In Western liberalism, that particularity has historically translated to white, male, propertied, and heterosexual; those who fall outside those categories (meaning women and other marginalised populations) are more likely to experience the subjection of false universals as oppressive hegemonic norms.

The knock-on effects of that false neutrality are myriad. Issues include the scope and substance (or 'form') of cosmopolitan universalism, charges of human rights' potential and manifested hegemonies and imperialism, the countercharges of relativism against critics of universalism, its seeming reliance on abstraction and the resulting transcendent individualism. One result of the abstraction/relativism opposition is the misinterpretation of cosmopolitanism's 'reflective distance' from one's own locale, which reduces dialogical theorising to contentions over 'detachment' rather than constructive debates on otherness. A certain reflective distance from one's own habitus is sometimes called for in order to reduce the bias of one's own particularity when attempting to understand those who are different. There seems to be some pride in cosmopolitan theorists' diversity of opinions on this idea of detachment: to what degree, how, and when is it even possible or good (Anderson, A. 1998: 267-268, 275-276). The importance of this cosmopolitan detachment to universality lies in understanding how it relates to abstraction and the particularity/universality opposition.

> Cosmopolitanism is, by contrast [to universality], a willingness to engage with the "Other"… Unlike universalism, it does not presume commonalities by positing a transcendent subject who is no subject in particular. It does not claim special authority for itself by putting things beyond contestation. Rather, it attempts to create a space in which genuine dialogue and opening of horizons are possible. Unlike some forms of universalism that seem to deny the claims of our embeddedness, our locations, and our subject positions, cosmopolitanism is aware of the inevitable pull of our locations, our embeddedness in particular cultures and contexts.
>
> It enjoins us to transcend our local affiliations and context, but the manner in which we will detach from our local or restrictive identities will not necessarily issue in a commonality of perspective. Cosmopolitanism envisions diverse modes of transcending, displacement, detachment. It enjoins us to transcend local horizons but without the expectation that this

> process will result in the same constellation above us. (Mehta 2000: 622-623; see also Anderson, A. 1998: 267)

The charges of false neutrality are not only about hegemonic dogmatism, but also about their effect on human rights discourses. Critical theorists have linked liberal cosmopolitan universalism's notions of who is human to its hegemonic force, which results in oppressive and dangerous exclusions (Mehta 2000: 622). Human rights bring those two issues together: the definition of who is 'human' is not universal (but is generally a given to normative cosmopolitan theorists), and those who do not agree with international human rights groups on that issue (and others) reject human rights interventions as hegemonic and imperialist.

The charge against human rights is that they provide a framework of values that is, in effect, hegemonic and Western-centric, but presented under the guise of universal morality. As such, not every state or international player subscribes to the idea of human rights, nor is there a consensus on to whom they apply. Indeed, Mignolo argues that the problem 'calls for a radical reconceptualization of the human rights paradigm as the next step toward cosmopolitan values (ethics) and regulations (politics)' (2000: 739). Critics ask the larger question of whether or not any value or human characteristic is truly universal and what that might mean, or whether the concept is unavoidably hegemonic. These issues affect rights and claims and, by extension, moral obligations.

Related to this is the question of motivation. How realistic is it to translate 'equal moral worth' into universal obligations that go beyond family, community and nation to the global? Critics voice concern that obligations to humanity cannot match obligations born out of relationality, whether it is familial or national (Hollinger 2001: 238). And if a level of abstraction is required to realise obligations to the unknown 'other', does it then follow that it must be rooted in the capacity to reason that ultimately leads us there, since it cannot be affinities, familial intimacies, or patriotism? Tagore indicated as much when he declared that 'the God of humanity has arrived at the gates of the ruined temple of the tribe' (1958: 162). The level of abstraction common to universalism is problematic to many different disciplines and political perspectives.[38] For example, O'Neill describes the communitarian complaint:

[38] Joan Cocks contends that theorists 'with very different political pedigrees have come to tout particularistic ethnic and national identities over cosmopolitan dispositions and cultural admixtures', including liberal pluralists, New Rightists, and neo-Marxists, who 'equate nationalism with democracy, repudiating internationalism as the self-serving ideology of "big battalion" states, metropolitan elites who

> Communitarians will not be convinced by those moral cosmopolitans who drift with a rhetoric of universal human rights, assert that all human beings have rights to have liberties respected and basic needs met, and that everyone has obligations to respect those liberties and that someone or other — but who? — has obligations to meet those needs. (O'Neill 2000: 189)

If we continue with the claim that cosmopolitanism depends on some form of universalism, then the process of reformulating universalism, along with autonomy, leads to the reconstruction of cosmopolitanism. What is revealed in this process is the mutually constitutive relationship between particularism and universalism, a productive tension that is more a continuum than an opposition (Anderson, A. 1998: 265; see also Zerilli 1998). Debates on this relationship, whilst robust and provocative, also expose some basic conceptual disagreements between theorists, as well as differences that seem to be a matter of semantics. Partly because of its multidisciplinary valence, there are keywords used within cosmopolitanism that have different meanings and interpretations depending on who is using them and in what context. For example, whilst Appiah advocates pluralism in cosmopolitanism, Hollinger sees cosmopolitanism as neither pluralistic nor universalistic (Appiah 1998: 94; 2006; Hollinger 2001: 239). Hollinger suggests that, although pluralism takes diversity into account and is thus compatible with cosmopolitanism, it does not encompass liberalism's prioritisation of the individual, thus setting it in opposition to the liberal universalism with which cosmopolitan theory has been most frequently associated (Hollinger 2001: 239-240).

The debates identified in this section form the grounds on which the more recent developments in cosmopolitanism are based. Beyond the questions of pluralism and abstraction is a general and growing acceptance of reconstructed forms of universality across perspectives that include its politicisation. The normative version, from a more poststructuralist perspective, is still rejected, because its liberal principles so often assume the same individualistic characteristics in everyone without taking into consideration differences in local norms and subjectivities.

I argue here that it is possible to reconcile normative Kantian theorists with those who are critical of cosmopolitan universality by framing cosmopolitan universalism as political and negotiated and in doing so, reevaluating what is universal in the cosmopolitan context. It seems to be in the politicised recognition of a human *condition* that some critics acknowledge and accept some form of universality. I refer to the human condition as Arendt does: it is not to be

---

impose their own way of life on others as if they were imposing civilization per se…'. (Cocks 2000: 46)
Chapter Five contains a more in-depth analysis of nationalism's relationship to cosmopolitanism.

confused with the (false) concept of human nature (which I would take to indicate innate characteristics common to everyone), but instead refers to 'the basic conditions under which life on earth has been given to man' (Arendt [1958] 1998: 7). This reconciliation does not require a complete renunciation of the Kantian moral perspective; instead it uses it as a guideline, or aid, in reconceptualising how universality might be less hegemonic and more useful to those who need the coverage it affords.

I use several theorists whose works in concert are constructive to that goal. Arendt takes rights out of the 'natural' and metaphysical and instead politicises what it means to have humanity in common. Butler combines the theoretical with the political as she considers Arendt's cosmopolitanism and her own. Arendt's and Butler's conceptions of plurality and cohabitation are also helpful in bringing ideas of obligation from the abstract back to the political realm. Cornell describes the ethical universality of the Southern African notion of *Ubuntu*.[39] Her analysis adds a different empirical dimension to these notions of obligation and interrelationality. Zerilli argues that feminists need to resist the charge of relativism in order to make necessary judgments of other cultural practices despite their reluctance and, like Arendt, suggests moving the universalism/relativism discourse into the political realm. Mignolo sees the problem as a semantic, postcolonial one, and advocates resisting the relativism charge by changing the terms of the discourse from 'relativism' to 'colonial discourse' (Mignolo 2000: 740). He believes that '(i)f we accept that actions, objects, beliefs, and so on are culture-relative, we hide the coloniality of power from which different cultures came into being in the first place' (Mignolo 2000: 741-742).

Human Rights

> [A cosmopolitan framework] is not very different from the framework of liberal universalism. It is, broadly speaking, assimilationist in its thrust, it does not say that people are not embedded in culture but it does say that as far as the public political culture is concerned the state should operate behind the veil of ignorance. It does say the state should be neutral with respect to the particularity of any culture or the particularity of any definition of the good life. It does, therefore, assume the ethical neutrality of the state, the unencumbered nature of the artificial

[39] Ubuntu as a southern African philosophy of ethics and theology that seems to me has an intersubjective understanding of humanity. Considered by some to be the basis of black African philosophy, it underpins the notion of the 'other person' as less about an individual with rights, and more about community, respect, and self-respect (Ramose 2003; Wilkinson 2003: 356). Ubuntu is much more than that, also implying a motion to being that challenges the non-unitary/fixed subject opposition. I discuss Ubuntu further later in this chapter.

liberal citizen… Is this framework of liberal universalism the only and best possible shell for cosmopolitan modernity? (Hall 2002: 27)

In the above quote, Stuart Hall describes a major conundrum liberal universalism presents: how can the state remain neutral to difference and embeddedness when the model for that neutrality is the disembedded 'artificial liberal citizen'? And would it be just if the state did recognise difference and embeddedness? Hall questions the entire liberal model for contemporary cosmopolitanism, suggesting that the liberal, universal framework on which cosmopolitanism has been based no longer works, if it ever did.

> Actual agreement is too strong a condition to impose on any critical standard, and I believe it misrepresents the motivating idea of human rights. To say that human rights are "universal" is not to claim that they are necessarily either accepted by or acceptable to everyone, given their other political and ethical beliefs. Human rights are supposed to be universal in the sense that they apply to or may be claimed by everyone. To hold, also, that a substantive doctrine of human rights should be consistent with the moral beliefs and values found among the world's conventional moralities is to say something both more and different, and potentially subversive of the doctrine's critical aims. (Beitz 2001: 274)

Beitz makes an interesting, if obvious, point. The concept of human rights would hardly be necessary if everyone agreed on and to them. But when Beitz writes that they are meant to be universal 'in the sense that they apply to or may be claimed by everyone', it is a reminder that human rights are not ultimately meant for those deciding what human rights might be. Human rights are meant to protect those under attack and duress to have some recourse, and it is their universality that gives them coverage and force. This does not preclude Nedelsky's point earlier that they are negotiated—it is what the courts are for, as human rights are always sites of contestation.

Cosmopolitanism's strong relationship with rights is often troubling. On the one hand, normative cosmopolitan theory is based on liberal individualism with one consequence being that human rights campaigns more easily favour individual political dissidents over faceless atrocities created by hunger and violence. On the other hand, the privileging of difference and diversity would seem to require some recognition of state or group rights, and these two concerns are usually set in opposition. The debates further branch out to who exactly are the bearers of those rights (i.e. states or individuals), and the form obligations to fulfilling such rights might take. The liberal focus on equal rights also manifests the equality/difference issue: should the law be blind to difference in its objective to achieve equality for all? These issues concern obligations and rights within the nation as well as to others (further discussed in Chapter Five).

Nussbaum is a staunch supporter of the liberal conceptualisation of universal rights, arguing that it offers the best path to equality and protection for women and other marginalised groups. Whilst advocating serious attention to the unique problems women face, she asserts that there are general values appropriate to all: 'the dignity of the person, the integrity of the body, basic political rights and liberties, basic economic opportunities, and so forth', are 'appropriate norms to be used in assessing women's lives in developing countries' (Nussbaum 2000: 41). She gives vivid examples of these norms' impact on the lives of the women she works with, but also recognises that how these norms translate will change for different women in different places; and that the threat of what she refers to as paternalism (in the form of the state or international human rights bodies) is very real and must be accounted for (Nussbaum 2000: 47, 53). It is somewhat troubling, though, that Nussbaum attributes resistance to those 'universal' norms to false consciousness and states that 'it is not clear that we should consider this the last word on the matter… Women's development groups typically encounter resistance initially, because women are afraid that change will make things worse' (2000: 42-43).

She may very well be right, and it is understandable that subjugated people would resist change under circumstances where it can 'make things worse' (the phenomenon of men who threaten to kill their wives if they leave them comes to mind); however, she appears to be in disagreement with Mahmood here over women's actions (or lack of) as 'instruments of their own oppression' in this case (Mahmood 2005: 8). To attribute such resistance to false consciousness does a disservice to those involved when they are likely to know exactly what their options are and what their 'best' choices may be, even if those choices are not desirable. Nussbaum is rightly adamant that these rights should be easily exercisable (they would otherwise lose their efficacy) and she makes clear that 'this requires material and institutional resources, including legal and social acceptance of the legitimacy of women's claims' (2000: 540). Whilst her commitment to the success of women's causes is clear, her assumptions about what it might be in their best interests can be construed as another form of paternalism. To reduce resistance to externally imposed rights, however well intentioned, lends credence to the charge of cosmopolitan imperialism. It would better serve the targeted parties if those directly involved in working with them on a continuing basis made an assessment that she could then reference.

Feminist theorists generally do agree on the importance of challenging cultural norms that subjugate women—though how and where those challenges take place is highly contested. Anne Phillips observes that what are really cultural norms are frequently to the detriment of women,

universalised to rationalise their existence (Phillips 2007: 32). But universalist claims have been used by women as well—exposing, as Butler muses, 'the spectral doubling of the concept itself' and calling (again) into question who has the right to speak it (Butler 2000: 38-39). 'This sensitivity to the ways the norms and perspectives of a dominant social group can come to claim the authority of universal truth has generated a larger scepticism about the status of all universal claims' (Phillips 2007: 32). It was the second-wave feminist position that there are universal causes for women's subjugation, and the response to it was 'sisterhood is global', positions since rejected. The need to deconstruct different power relationships in different places at different times has been a lesson in the area of particularity and the irreducibility of difference for feminists, whilst also recognising that cultures do not exist 'in mutual isolation' (Phillips 2007: 33).

There is little doubt that cultural norms have too often served to subjugate women and Nussbaum may be right in saying that anything with 'bite' quickly turns into 'making normative recommendations'; however, she still contends that her approach to universalism is 'sensitive to pluralism and cultural difference' (Zerilli 2009: 299-300). The contention is dubious. It remains clear to me that another method of negotiating universals is still called for.

Feminist causes have benefited from Western conceptions of autonomy and universal equality, with qualifications, especially regarding the equality/difference conundrum. On the grounds that the law should be gender-blind and universal, women in the US gained civil rights (such as suffrage and marital independence). At the same time, women have also fought for gender-specific rights, including those regarding pregnancy, particularly in the workplace. There is a concurrent, if challenging, move within feminism and cosmopolitan universalism debates to acknowledge and respect difference without giving up on some form of a universal equality ethic (Phillips 1992: 27; Robbins 1998b: 260).

Some critical theorists question the very presuppositions on which normative theorists base rights debates. The question of who counts as human highlights the inadequacies of abstract universalism's support for human rights. Butler rightly points out that universalism has not helped sexual dissidents (although there has been some progress in the UN, LGBTQ rights are still not part of the UNDR). In her work on lesbian and gay human rights, it became clear to her that 'the universal' is still a contested term within 'various cultures and mainstream human rights groups' alike when it comes to determining who is human. Sexual dissidents are almost completely excluded from 'the existing conventions governing the scope of human rights' and,

given the overt persecution they are subject to worldwide (indicating the need for protection), the logical assumption would be that where they fail to qualify is as 'human' (Butler 1995b: 129-130). Whilst there have been gains in some quarters, other countries, such as Uganda, continue to move in the opposite direction and criminalize homosexuality and transgenderism to alarming degrees. Countries that have been colonized are more likely to criminalise sexual and gender dissidence as a nationalist form of resistance, though in Uganda's case, it appears to be linked to imperialism by US Christian evangelists. The fear, as Butler puts it, is that 'what is named as the universal is the parochial property of the dominant culture, and that the "universalizability" is indissociable from imperial expansion' (Butler 2000: 15). In addition, it has not been clear that rights have uniformly helped those for whom they are intended (Brown 2000).

In *Suffering Rights as Paradoxes*, Wendy Brown offers an astute analysis of the needs and pitfalls of rights for women (2000). Her concern is a reification of the status of women as victims by the very rights designed to protect them. She suggests that the more specific the rights are, 'the more likely they are to build that fence insofar as they are more likely to encode a definition of women premised upon our subordination in the transhistorical discourse of liberal jurisprudence' (Brown 2000: 231). At issue is the regulatory dimension of identity-based rights (which she acknowledges as Foucault's contribution):

> To have a right *as* a woman is not to be free of being designated and subordinated by gender. Rather, while it may entail some protection from the most immobilizing features of that designation, it reinscribes the designation as it protects us, and thus enables our further regulation through that designation. (Brown 2000: 231-232)

Paradoxically, as Brown (referencing Catherine Mackinnon) observes, the more gender-neutral the right, 'the more likely it is to enhance the privilege of men and eclipse the needs of the women as subordinates'. She infers that there is a cost to such rights, that they are always deployed within 'a discursive, hence normative context, precisely the context in which "woman" (and any other identity category) is iterated and reiterated'. She notes a similar dilemma posed by such issues as pornography, where what some women consider as sex-positive and freeing others experience as a violation, and asks, 'what does it mean to encode one or the other perspective as a right in the name of advancing women's equality?' (2000: 233). And whilst women may 'lose' by being treated as equals in divorce, custody, and child support hearings because of their lower earning power, the problem of gender-specific laws also backfires. Brown observes that women's rights 'tend to reinscribe heterosexuality both as defining what women are, and defining what constitutes women's vulnerability and violability', because gender laws

tend to assume heterosexuality *and* because sex(ual difference) and sexuality are considered different objects of discrimination (2000: 233-234). Women's right's projects, she states, are part of that reinscription: '… the rights that women bear and exercise as women tend to consolidate the regulative norms of gender, and thus function at odds with challenging those norms' (2000: 234). Zerilli seems to agree. In her critique of Ernesto Laclau's work on universality, she sees parallels with Simone de Beauvoir's assessment of the particular in universality. Beauvoir 'showed that universal is just another word for Man, and that Woman is the remainder of particularity that haunts the masculine subject's claim to transcend all particularisms' (Zerilli 1998: 16).

Who bears the responsibility of upholding rights is a question of obligation. O'Neill believes that justice should begin with obligations, rather than rights. 'It is, after all, obligations, and not rights, that will need enforcing' (O'Neill 2000: 136). Butler, too, speaks in terms of moral obligations as well as rights when the subject at hand is the incongruous valuing of a life here versus a life there (Butler 1996; 2008). As such, obligations and rights cannot be divorced from each other, and if one is universal, so is the other. 'All advocates of rights are agreed that *if* there are universal claim rights to liberty, then the corollary obligations must also be universal' (O'Neill 2000: 101).

The so-called Rights of Man took form in various proclamations during the Enlightenment, most notably in the French *Déclaration des droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen* of 1789, the American Declaration of Independence of 1776, and in 1948, the UDHR. All three documents refer to fundamental, or inalienable, rights—that is, rights one has by virtue of being born and human. But the point Giorgio Agamben and Arendt have focused much of their energies on is the nation state as is the bearer of these rights (Agamben 2006; Arendt 1968: 297). Paradoxically, the moment one becomes stateless, the very moment that one loses the rights of the national and is in need of those fundamental, natural, 'God-given' rights, one also loses any recourse to the enforcement of those rights.

> [Loss of national rights] in all instances entail the loss of human rights; the restoration of human rights… has been achieved so far only through the restoration or the establishment of national rights. The conception of human rights, based upon the assumed existence of a human being as such, broke down at the very moment when those who professed to believe in it were for the first time confronted with people who had indeed lost all other qualities and specific relationships—except that they were still human. The world found nothing sacred in the abstract nakedness of being human. (Arendt 1968: 299)

Arendt is not espousing the powers of the nation state. She is making an observation and contemplating a shift in the way we think about rights. Although neither she nor O'Neill is a proponent of the nation state, Arendt is ambivalent because the state makes the polity possible. In reviewing Arendt's issue with Jewish identity, Butler writes, 'Rights do not belong to individuals, in Arendt's view, but are produced in concert' (Butler 2007). When people are deprived of basic human rights, according to Arendt, they are deprived of 'a place in the world which makes opinions significant and actions effective' (Arendt 1968: 296). It is in the exercising of rights that they come into being and, as an action, this makes the coming-into-being of rights a political act in itself (Arendt [1958] 1998: 7).

Arendt's belief in the right to have rights placed those rights squarely in the political realm (Arendt 1968: 296-297). Her rejection of the abstract Rights of Man was based on what she saw as the failure of human rights efforts to apply outside of the nation state, a result of watching stateless Jews losing every conceivable right during the Holocaust. That loss was not accounted for in the 18th century notion of (human) rights because they were presumed to spring from the 'nature of man' (Arendt 1968: 297-298). Arendt understood that those rights are indeed artificial if they can cease to exist at any point.

> If a human being loses his political status, he should, according to the implications of the inborn and inalienable rights of man, come under exactly the situation for which the declarations of such general rights provided. Actually, the opposite is the case. It seems that a man who is nothing but a man has lost the very qualities which made it possible for other people to treat him as a fellow-man. (Arendt 1968: 299-300)

Thus, for Arendt, abstract human rights, instead of being universal, lose their potency outside of the protection of national sovereignty. Indeed, to her, the basic deprivation of human rights is not about the loss of freedom and justice (which she associations with citizenship), but the loss of a community, or place in the world. Losing human rights is not the deprivation 'of the right to freedom but of the right to action; not the right to think whatever they please, but of the right to opinion', and that ability is always political (Arendt 1968: 296). We have the right to rights, but only in the context of the polity, because it is the community that is 'willing and able to guarantee any rights whatsoever' (Arendt 1968: 297). This is not the formal sovereignty of the nation state that guarantees rights. It is, rather, the place of belonging, where an individual is part of the polity that can guarantee rights.

According to Arendt, then, human rights are inextricably attached to the polity, and as such are always political and not 'natural'. This position is more compatible with cosmopolitan

conceptions of universal human rights than the problematic question of who is human (and thus deserving), or what 'equal moral worth' might mean when that question prompts different answers. It does, however, require negotiation, which I discuss later in this chapter.

The move to place universalism into the political entails disentangling it from the philosophical and the metaphysical. It is not a simple task, because universalism, as it is known in the West, is heavily grounded in the Western philosophical tradition. This is particularly true for cosmopolitanism and moral philosophy, which begin with the notion of universal equality, evidenced by the three proclamation documents mentioned above. Arendt distances herself further from the notion of natural rights when she argues that equality is not a feature we are born with, but something acted upon.

> Equality, in contrast to all that is involved in mere existence, is not given us, but is the result of human organization insofar as it is guided by the principle of justice. We are not born equal; we become equal as members of a group on the strength of our decision to guarantee ourselves mutually equal rights (Arendt 1968: 301).

Arendt does not categorically dismiss moral philosophy. According to Butler, she 'makes the case for the priority of moral philosophy to legal decision-making' but only in the sense of 'independent judgment of what law should be' and more about 'philosophical thinking than legal reasoning' (Butler 2009: Pt 4, 6:10). She is talking about her own judgment against Adolph Eichmann, but seems to be suggesting that to judge, to be 'lawgivers… whenever we act', is a personal responsibility everyone has by virtue of the politics of plurality (Arendt and Kohn 2003: 41). Butler contends that this is 'a certain kind of affirmation of Kantian practical judgment. Arendt is supplying, it seems to me, a philosophical norm for just law, bas[ed] on a Kantian notion of self-legislation' (Butler 2009: Pt 8 0:5): rather than actual legal reasoning, this 'philosophical norm' is about how one thinks legal justice should be. It is an important point, because as Butler goes on to state:

> On the other hand, however, she's elaborating a social ontology without which no exercise of freedom and no claim to rights is finally possible. Plurality is the condition for the exercise of rights, an exercise through which we also constitute ourselves as social beings. Sociality is both the pre-condition of the legitimate exercise of rights, but also the effect of that very exercise (ibid.).

Butler understands Arendt's notion of freedom as 'a social enactment, or an exercise of a certain kind of social ontology'—there is no individual freedom, only exercising freedom in concert, and this is 'essential to her idea of the right to belong, modes of belonging, right to belong to

communities, and to be able to exercise freedom by virtue of that belonging' (Butler 2009: Pt 8, 2:30).

Sexual rights

It is clear that there is a need for global human rights, whether the responsibility to enforce them is a state or a supranational organisation. When determining the most constructive approach to solving problems of universalism—how individuals can be protected whilst respecting group and state rights as well—we can use a variety of examples to think through positions on particularity and human rights. Religion freedom and gender rights are two common issues often brought up in this context because they are 'hot-button' issues today (and have been for some time). But the question of sexual rights, especially regarding non-heterosexual individuals is pertinent because 1) these individuals often get no family support and may well be ostracised from their homes and communities, unlike religious and ethnic minorities; and 2) it has become a polarising issue on the world stage. The UN is urging countries to refrain from persecuting homosexuals whilst in some countries, especially Uganda, Ghana, and Kenya today, persecution has risen to a fevered pitch. Severe laws have been passed sentencing those who commit homosexual acts, as well as against those who harbour homosexuals in any way (Amnesty 2012). At the same time, countries with a history of homophobia have been passing LGBT rights laws, particularly regarding marriage, with the same speed.

The question is, then, how are these differences negotiated? Should there be sanctions against nations that persecute sexual dissidents, or should a country's cultural norms be respected, and the issue left as 'internal' or 'domestic'? Surely in the case of laws that sentence homosexuals to death, sanctions are in order. Yet that is not always the case for women who go against religious laws, as in the case of adultery, so there is precedence for respecting state sovereignty and religious freedom. Yet this goes against all forms of global human rights, and rightfully so. Cosmopolitanism puts the individual's rights and agency first. That includes sexual rights and the right to determine who one will share a family life with.

Many of the worst cases of homosexual persecution in Africa today, particularly regarding Uganda and Kenya, are the direct result of US evangelists 'missionary work' proselytising and including homosexuality as sinful acts that must be punished. It is a form of imperialism and colonialism, both recent and historical. That must be addressed first, whilst respecting the right for cultures to determine their own norms. But as a cosmopolitan, the individual's rights still supersede those group and state rights. It is an issue of global justice, of human rights, and in

some cases sanctioning and opening borders to refugees may be the only solutions until negotiations change the status of such individuals.

Particularity

Critical theorists have questioned the oppositional framing of universality and particularity at the outset. The focus on particularity is that 'the universalization of the particular seeks to elevate a specific content to a global condition, making an empire of its local meaning' (Butler 2000: 31). Butler and Joan Scott demonstrate that continuing to position particularity against universality, even with the intention of incorporating both, leaves the problem of hegemony in universality unsolved. Whilst these approaches are important contributions to the debate on universal ethics, they do not by themselves solve the problem.

Whilst human rights may open cosmopolitanism up to a significant degree of politicisation, Mehta claims that it 'in all its senses, shares affinities with universalism from which it historically often has been indistinguishable', including its association with imperialism in the name of emancipation (2000: 622). He elaborates on the charge:

> To be a universalist was to participate in a project to emancipate individuals and cultures from their traditions and quotidian forms of existences into modes of collective life whose authority could be underwritten by universal, tradition-independent norms or justified in the name of an ideal or a conception of the good, higher than those of the cultures it sought to replace. But in recent history, universalism was not simply a philosophical idea. It was often embodied in a concrete historical project: imperialism. The historical legitimacy provided to imperialism by three of the most powerful universalist ideologies of the West, Christianity, Liberalism, and Marxism, has made universalism an object of suspicion. (ibid.)

However one understands their impact, all three were meant to be liberationist ideologies in some way. Emancipatory politics is the reason why social activists have been more forgiving of universality as they usually have some form of it in their core beliefs, the UDHR being a prime example. Those invoking the UDHR do so because it is meant to be a working document, not a list of suggestions. Though its actual effect on human rights and international collaboration is contested, it is widely considered to be the premier human rights model (Chomsky 2002: 52). The 'universal' rights of the Geneva Convention, far from covering all prisoners of war, apply only to the signatories of the Convention. Those who are stateless, or are from non-signatory states, are not protected (Butler 2004: 86). In addition, the US Declaration of Independence was meant to be a declaration of universalisms pronouncing the equal status of 'all men' and their right to pursue 'happiness' with the goal of ensuring economic and religious freedoms. Further,

Buddhism's employment of an egalitarian universalism, the idea that all people are part of the same whole, offered Indian rulers and merchants a way out of the political, social, and economic restrictions imposed by the Hindu caste system.[40] Yet, despite the intentions behind these liberatory moves, each either perpetuated or instigated the exclusion of whole subpopulations. Given this complex association with human rights, the common conflation of cosmopolitanism with universality, and universality's association with imperialism, these relationships should be critiqued together. In every case, what was presented as universal was fundamentally political and exclusionary.

Feminist discourse ethics

In determining a cosmopolitan perspective from either a moral or political position, valuing either one over the other presents problems. In the context of feminist ethics as a branch of moral philosophy, Hutchings explains why the differentiation has been important to feminist theory.

> Morality is defined as being about values and principles that transcend the particularities of any specific human life, whereas politics is about the struggles and negotiations through which those particularities are constructed, sustained, challenged, and managed. [Western discourses on moral theories, religious and philosophical are] fundamentally political in one key sense. All of them purport to be the revelation of God or outcome of reason (or both), but all of them turn out, in whole or in part, to be about the reflection and maintenance of relations of power in which women are systematically oppressed, excluded, and silenced. (Hutchings 2004: 239-240)

Hutchings contrasts morality and politics within gender power relations because feminist theorists disagree so widely over whether the problem is in principle or application and, thus, the debates have 'less to do with the substantive accounts of justice and the good on offer and more to do with the question of whether feminist claims about justice and the good have any authoritative foundation or can achieve universal reach across different times and places' (2004: 240; 2005: 157). But for Hutchings, those who charge feminist universalists with the hegemonic silencing of women as the 'patriarchal mainstream' come dangerously close to relativism.

> For feminist universalists, their critics risk reducing morality to politics in the sense of making all moral claims contingent on specificities of power and culture and thereby losing the possibility of making the moral critique of women's oppression that is needed to underpin feminism as a political project. (2004: 240)

[40] This social and economic system had prevented merchants from associating with those outside their caste, whilst top powerful castes were exempted from paying land taxes (Darian 1977: 229-235). The inclusion of universality was a liberating political move that opened up the market for merchants by eliminating their caste obstacles, and increased the income for rulers by equalising land taxes.

Hutchings critiques various feminist ways of adjudicating the universal and particular in feminist theory, and suggests that through the work of Gayatri Spivak, Benhabib, and Iris Marion Young, 'there is a level and quality of moral engagement that is logically prior to the ways in which moral claims might be grounded or their scope determined' (2004: 258). She recognises the need to form opinions and judgments through 'the moral encounter as offering the possibility of mutual transformation'; and she makes a good argument for taking on Spivak's 'learning to learn' and listen appeal as a method for interacting with the unfamiliar (Hutchings 2004: 254).

> The notion of learning to learn reflects Spivak's view of the need for metropolitan feminists to put into question not only their own moral convictions but also their assumptions about how one grasps and is able to debate the moral convictions of subaltern others…. Spivak's notion of learning to learn in the context of global politics is one that stresses not the acquisition of information or even understanding, but an attentiveness and openness in relation to the other through which both self and other may be transformed… Learning to learn is about being open to learn other sorts of moral lessons. What is involved, however, is always *education*, an inherently illiberal and undemocratic mode of encounter, in which both teacher and pupil may be transformed, but from radically unequal positions of power, and therefore always in different (not necessarily contradictory) ways. (ibid.)

Hutchings feminist discourse ethics on negotiation are compatible with Appiah's suggestion that cosmopolitans should not 'come to the table… with heavy philosophical baggage, because then you're making it a condition of the conversation that people agree with you, and the whole point about the conversation is that whoever comes, we'll talk to' (Appiah 2008). But she goes further in suggesting how to negotiate by 'learning to learn'. Her approach is also compatible with Butler's conceptualisation of universality as both impossible and necessary and in an endless cycle of interrogation and reformulation. The foundation for universality is always contingent, an ever-receding horizon (Anderson, A. 1998: 281). The cycle necessitates a continuous act of cultural and linguistic translation resulting in a 'radically transformative process' (Anderson, A. 1998: 282; Butler 2000: 20).

> … there is no cultural consensus on an international level about what ought and ought not to be a claim to universality, who may make it, and what form it out to take. Thus, for the claim to work, for it to compel consensus, and for the claim, performatively, to enact the very universality it enunciates, it must undergo a set of translations into the various rhetorical and cultural contexts in which the meaning and force of the universal claims are made. (Butler 2000: 35)

> The task that cultural difference sets for us is the articulation of universality through a difficult labor of translation, one in which the terms made to stand for one another are transformed in the process, and where the movement of that unanticipated transformation establishes the universal as that which is yet to be achieved and which, in order to resist domestication, may never be fully or finally achievable. (Butler 1995b: 130-131)

In this way, cultural particularities are always part of the process, but they are always translated in the direction of other cultures, always retaining something of the original. There is the ever-present risk of mis-translation, of losing the direction of the universalism, but this as well is part of the process of interrogation and reformulation. Universality belongs 'to an open-ended hegemonic struggle' (Butler 2000: 38). Butler sees the universal 'in the structural features of any and all languages' (Butler 2000: 34). It is not about subjective cognition, but 'linked to the problem of reciprocal recognition… [which] itself is dependent on custom' (Butler 2000: 20). Consequently, there is the need for cultural *and* linguistic translation. Butler's in-depth analysis of universality involves identity formation (identity formed through exclusion) that I will address further in Chapter Five.

If we conceive of universalism as Butler does, as never-ending processes of interrogation, interpretation, misinterpretation and reformulation, it is complementary to Arendt's politicised negotiations. Butler's sociality is a different form of Arendt's plurality, but the condition is the same. Hutchings' feminist discourse ethics seem to me to be a highly useful tool for Butler's negotiation processes. Reformulating universalism through these perspectives and approaches frees cosmopolitan universalism and allows it to acknowledge its integration with the particular productively, thus enabling greater resistance to false neutralities and hegemonies. Negotiating the universality of human rights is not a fail-safe process, either for such resistance or for guaranteeing coverage for those in need, but it acknowledges the particularity of universality, and provides one way of accommodating cosmopolitanism's necessity of it.

How, then, does one acknowledge the particularity of global humans rights for non-heterosexual persons, and the particularity of the culture that persecutes them? Internationally, as I suggested, sanctions and accepting refugees are two answers. But the change in cultural norms, whilst always interacting with difference and others, must come from within. It is the people of those cultures who can enact the change from within; it is nothing short of imperialist to impose the change from without.

Relativism

> The truth of the doctrine of cultural (or historical—it is the same thing) relativism is that we can never apprehend another people's or another period's imagination neatly, as though it was our own. The falsity of it is that we can therefore never genuinely apprehend it at all. We can apprehend it well enough, at least as well as we apprehend anything else not properly ours, but we do so not by looking behind the interfering glosses that connect us to it, but through them. (Geertz 2000: 44).

Feminists and other critical theorists rejecting abstract universality and taking the local into account, frequently face the 'relativist' accusation. Recalling Susan Moller Okin, Zerilli understands that, however reluctantly, feminists 'need to make judgments about cultural and political practices not always our own and, where appropriate, declare them "bad for women" and refuse them our political support' (2009: 295). The reluctance Zerilli writes of is borne out of a fear of slipping into the cultural relativism Caney describes, and to which universality is framed as diametrically opposed. Zerilli digs deeper and disputes the charge often made against critics of universalised liberal principles by, like Arendt, taking those problems of universality out of philosophy, and placing them into the political context of negotiating 'outsidedness' and the particular (2009: 310). She pursues the charges of relativism, asking, 'what other sort of problem might the problem of relativism conceal?' (2009: 305). For her, the allegation is a red herring, an act of dismissing particularism as a nihilistic refusal to judge.

> The real threat of nihilism is not the loss of standards as such but the refusal to accept the consequences of that loss. The idea that by holding fast to universal criteria we shall avoid a crisis of critical judging neglects the very real possibility that such rules can function as a mental crutch that inhibits our capacity to judge critically. What matters from the perspective of our critical capacities is not the content of the rules as such but the very dependence on rules (Arendt 1971, 436). Rules are like a banister to which we hold fast for fear of losing our footing and not being able to judge at all (Zerilli 2009: 309).

Mignolo and others believe that the charge of relativism is often a cloak for the dismissal of political engagement. In his postcolonial critique of cosmopolitanism, he maintains that what is needed to avoid cultural relativism for critical theorists attempting 'critical and dialogic' cosmopolitanism is a change in the terms of the discourse:

> I have been suggesting… that cultural relativism should be dissolved into colonial difference and that the colonial difference should be identified as the location for the critical and dialogic cosmopolitanism that confronts managerial global designs of ideologues and executives of the network society. Instead of cosmopolitanism managed from above (that is, global designs), I am proposing cosmopolitanism, critical and dialogic, emerging from the various spatial and historical locations of the colonial difference… (Mignolo 2000: 741).

By reinterpreting the problem of cultural relativism as colonial difference, not only is a more analytical approach to particularity and difference achieved, but a greater of understanding of the connection between cosmopolitan universality and its imperialist associations is as well. Whilst integrating his postcolonial analysis with Hutchings' feminist discourse ethics would be useful, there is an aspect of Mignolo's work that appears strategic in trying to negate the charge of

relativism that I am unsure is a useful endeavour. I do not think that it would inhibit normative universalists by itself from continuing to use the phrase against critics.

Caney states his dissatisfaction that he, Nussbaum, and other universalists concerned with international distributive justice, are regularly charged with 'moral imperialism' and with dismissing 'cultural respect' (2000: 235). Describing 'transcultural perspectives', he states that such positions take 'a relativist approach, according to which morality requires fidelity to the norms and values of one's community' (2005: 25). Nussbaum shares with Caney a disdain for 'relativists', who they see as privileging difference over justice. She praises the groundedness of the liberal 'conception of the good', maintaining that such more or less liberal conceptions are evaluative from the start and notes, whilst basically agreeing with Caney, the existence of cultural 'disagreements' is no reason to ignore global injustices (Caney 2000: 530; Nussbaum 2000: 39-40).

Caney gives perhaps the most pointed response to charges of hegemonic universalism with the countercharge that non-universalists are relativists:

> Given that our (Western) cultures affirm the humanitarian principle of aiding the poor, it follows that *if we are to comply with the cultural relativist injunction* we must aid the poor and disadvantaged abroad. To do otherwise is for us to act in contradiction of our shared values and norms. The point is well expressed by Charles Beitz: 'One might say that we are compelled to take a global view in matters of social justice by features internal to our conception of moral personality, however parochial it may be'. (Caney 2000: 533)

Caney's position on global distributive justice *is* defensible: his contention that 'those who are affluent should divert resources to the needy and impoverished and the international economy should be reformed to allow people access to the resources necessary for their livelihood' is a difficult position to argue against for anyone committed to global distributive justice (2000: 239). However, whilst Caney's strong support of international human rights may be commendable, his broad reference to cultural relativism as a defence of his moral universalism to cover a range of critical perspectives indicates a lack of interest in widening the scope of his critique; it is usually in the context of defending charges of hegemonic universalism, but those defences tend to focus on 'relativism' rather than the problem of hegemony. Caney seems to be missing the larger point that some cosmopolitan theorists are making in their critiques. The greater issue is the willingness to consider other cultural positions, not only out of respect for those differences and as recognition of their agency and autonomy, but because those positions may well influence Western normative positions if taken seriously. It prompts the question of

why so many normative theorists remain entrenched in Western liberal cosmopolitan theory when the failure to diversify is in itself so strikingly uncosmopolitan.

I am in agreement with Zerilli, and Mignolo (above), that the charge of relativism is not about particularity or a failure to judge, but about suppressing plurality (Zerilli 2009: 304). Her critique centres on the similar attempts by Nussbaum and Benhabib to develop feminist 'judging practices', necessary to counter the relativist threat. Nussbaum's criticism of 'relativism' is that it limits critical judgment by restricting that capacity to local norms (2009: 300). Nussbaum asks why we should settle for local ideas instead of the '"the best ideas we can find"… for what Nussbaum, following John Rawls, calls an "overlapping consensus"'. Zerilli's concern is what 'best ideas' might be, and from where they emerge. She recognises these 'best ideas' appear not to be neutral and universal, but Western and particular, warning that Nussbaum's strategy is 'typical of new universalist feminist approaches to the problem of judgment in the wake of multicultural and postcolonial critiques'. Likewise, Benhabib basically advocates the Habermasian 'universalist deliberative democracy model', insisting that 'all political claims of culture should be adjudicated according to certain normative criteria', that, like Nussbaum's, are quite specifically liberal (Zerilli 2009: 301).

Whilst Zerilli commends the 'space for thinking about a genuinely international practice of feminist critique', opened by Nussbaum and Benhabib in their reassessment of culture as static and homogenous, she argues that in ways different from each other, both 'smuggle in as universal their own judgments based on their own (Western) normative criteria; occluded is the very act of judgment itself' (ibid.). Her concern is the limited critique of the turn towards 'cultural hybridity' in these 'new universalists'' rejection of cultural essentialism:

> Each thinker construes the problem of multiculturalism and cultural conflict as a phantom of sorts: as it turns out, cultures are hybrid and fluid, so genuine clashes, where they exist, can be adjudicated by the already shared "best ideas" (Nussbaum 2000, 49) or "norms of universal respect and egalitarian reciprocity" (Benhabib 2002, 37). By attributing, rather than exporting, these ideas or norms to non-Western cultures, both Benhabib and Nussbaum seek to evade, be it intentionally or not, the established criticisms of ethnocentricism brought by feminist, multicultural, and postcolonial theorists. (Zerilli 2009: 301-302)

The salient observations here in the cosmopolitan context are 1) the shift from 'exporting' to the more obfuscating 'attributing', and 2) the starting point. Caney insists there are universal moral values, categorically and absolutely. Nussbaum and Benhabib acknowledge difference and particularity, but approach it from their standpoint first, looking outward to see (and form) what

they perceive is similar to their values and perspectives. Nussbaum does not seem to recognise the possibility that the liberal values of dignity, bodily integrity, and political rights and liberties are projections onto the values of other cultures, despite suspiciously liberal terminology that claims to value difference. Zerilli sees the error of projection in that strategy and, in similar ways to Arendt and Butler, proposes the opposite: do not devalue the irreducibility of difference. One must start from the assumption of difference rather than similarity, because the latter inevitably involves projection. Hutchings' critique of Spivak's 'learning to learn' exemplifies the position. It is not, as Zerilli argues, philosophical or even epistemological (Zerilli 2009: 306, 307). It is political.

This approach is highly compatible with cosmopolitanism. The person judging will always have their standpoint and the search for similarity and for common ground is not only understandable, but also useful. Nevertheless, it should not be the starting point. Zerilli is emphatic that despite the ever-present danger of ethnocentrism, the criteria originating from our own positions are not only inevitable, but also cautiously constructive.

> "To believe that this rootedness is *only* negative and that one should and actually could get rid of it through some infinite purification of reason," writes Cornelius Castoriadis, "is the illusion of a naive rationalism. It is not simply that this rootedness is the condition of our knowledge . . . it is also a *positive* condition, for it is our own particularity which allows us access to the universal. It is because we are attached to a given view, categorical structure, and project that we are able to say something meaningful about the past" (1987, 163) and about other cultures and practices. But if rationalism is an illusion, it is equally illusory to think that every attempt to understand and judge other cultures must be from a "native" perspective. (Zerilli 2009: 310-311)

The theorists referenced here agree that some form of critical judgment and opinion are necessary in transnational issues of justice. Zerilli draws on Uma Narayan's dissatisfaction with the myth of the 'authentic insider' as judge, the resistance to judge, its paradoxical yet consequential levels of harm, and her advice on ways forward:

> "Refusing to judge issues affecting Third-World communities," writes Uma Narayan, "is often a facile and problematic attempt to compensate for a history of misjudgment. Such refusals can become simply one more Western gesture that confirms the moral inequality of Third-World cultures by shielding them from the moral and political evaluations that 'Western' contexts and practices are subject to" (Narayan 1997, 150)… Furthermore, "the commitment 'not to judge' Other cultures seems in effect to be a commitment 'not to *express* one's judgments'—which only serves to insulate these unexpressed judgments from challenges, corrections, or interrogations they might profit from" (150). What Western feminists "need to cultivate is not a refusal to judge" but an ability "to distinguish misrepresentations and cultural imperialism from normatively justifiable criticisms" (150) (Zerilli 2009: 297; see also Hutchings 2004: 256).

The need for representation is neither lessened by the danger of misrepresentation, nor reduced by the threats of ethnocentrism, imperialism, and colonialism. Narayan argues that unexpressed thoughts and sentiments are more harmful than risky political engagement, because it forecloses interrogation and any possibility of a learning exchange. Hutchings claims that 'To refuse to "represent" the other is to block the self-understanding and the possibility of moral transformation of the critical theorist herself' (2004: 256). For Hutchings, Spivak's approach is more helpful to 'feminist international ethics' than one geared towards 'a conception of the moral encounter as an egalitarian dialogue' (Hutchings 2004: 257). The moral encounter with the stranger, the other, is never on level ground. For the cosmopolitan, however, it is an opportunity to engage with the fact of plurality:

> What interests us in other cultures are "other human possibilities in their absolute singularity" (Castoriadis 1987, 163), that is, the opening of the world to us through human plurality. This singularity, the particular, is visible to us on the condition that we not subsume it under either a transcendent rule or a rule given by our own culture. And yet we must judge it from the place where we stand, which is to say, from our own social, historical, and cultural location. (Zerilli 2009: 311-312)

Zerilli understands 'outsidedness' as a 'condition of judging' (2009: 310). Outsidedness may be the default cosmopolitan position. Given that cosmopolitanism focuses on (global) principles of justice, as with feminism, there is no avoidance of cultural judgments. Despite the insistence that standpoint is inevitable, it does not constitute 'the whole of judgment nor the ground for its validity'. Arendt's conceptualisation of judgment is that it is both a right and an obligation—it stems from the right to belong (because there is no judging, no voicing an opinion when there is no place to safeguard that right, and because one is obligated to judge others, at the very least, in the event that they reject the fact of plurality and cohabitation). To her, 'Judging is less an act of subsuming… and more an act of discerning and differentiating'—which, Zerilli points out, is close to the Kantian definition of reflective judgment (2009: 308).

> In the realm of politics, Arendt argues, we have always to do with opinion and thus with value judgments that cannot be adjudicated by an appeal to the objective truth criteria and the ability to give proofs that are at stake in the validity of cognitive (determinative) judgments (see Zerilli 2006). Following Kant's account of judgments of taste, Arendt (1982) holds that, if political judgments are not objective in the aforementioned sense, neither are they merely subjective, matters of individual or cultural preference (Zerilli 2009: 308-309).

Zerilli takes Narayan's and Arendt's positions that there is not only no such thing as an 'authentic insider', but that it is the spectator and not the actor 'who occupies the position from which it is possible to critically judge the objects of the common world' (2009: 312).

> To form an opinion is to see the world from more than the insider perspective given in a historically and culturally situated human subjectivity. The position of the spectator is associated with a form of rooted but impartial seeing; it is not the view from nowhere but the view from somewhere enlarged by taking account of other views. The ability to form an opinion is political, and its name is "representative thinking" (ibid.).

Thus, to Arendt the political act of forming an opinion is 'representative thinking'. Zerilli sees judging as 'an uneasy confrontation with the opinions of others', but the 'ability to judge critically must be differentiated from the capacity for identification, recognition, or empathy', and advises us not to confuse an 'ethical stance' with political representative thinking (Zerilli 2009: 312-314).

> It is important to put oneself in the place of the other, not because ethics calls for it (though it well may) but because seeing the world from different perspectives is the political condition of impartiality and objectivity (Zerilli 2009: 313-314).

It is related to the complicated cosmopolitan notions of detachment and reflective distance, but Zerilli and Arendt both underline the point that this is not a rejection of one's situatedness—it is an acknowledgement that situatedness exists. There is no blind obedience to nationalisms that might overrule the results of representative thinking and judgment. There is no claim to innocence of an international crime due to its legal stature in one's nation state, no obedience to orders as a qualification for transgressing rights. No one illustrated the importance of such personal responsibility within a cosmopolitan sensibility more than Arendt, in her polemic against Adolph Eichmann in *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (1994). Never a proponent of nationalism or absolute sovereignty, her mistrust of the nation state is partly of the abstract form rights and obligations take when assigned strictly to authority. For Arendt, the problem lies in the ease with which such authority allows one to abdicate not just moral responsibility and accountability towards others but of 'personal judgment' (so undeniably manifested in the Nazi regime) (Arendt and Kohn 2003: 24). In his critique of Arendt's Jewish cosmopolitanism, Sznaider states,

> It is based on being able to look ourselves in the mirror and say that we have fulfilled the moral obligations that make us who we are. And that includes above all the special responsibilities we have to particular others who have been attached to us by accidents of history and birth. To sweep this aside is to forget who you are and to free yourself from all personal responsibility… Everything that happens in the world has a moral significance. This idea of an intimate connection between morality and identity is Arendt's answer to what it means to maintain a tension between the universal and the particular' (2007: 119).

Detachment

Critical theorists point out that the individual, as the basic unit of moral concern, presumes an agreement on who is human and what it means to be human, although history's genocides prove otherwise. Sexual dissidents are regularly persecuted and put to death in several countries: the humanity question was highlighted when the president of Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe, declared lesbians and gay men to be 'worse than pigs' and 'less than human' and when the Ugandan parliament repeatedly revived legislation ('Kill the Gays' bill) that make homosexuality punishable by death and aiding and abetting (i.e. by friends, family or human rights organisations) punishable with a seven-year prison sentence (Amnesty 1999: 3; 2012). Cosmopolitanism's detachment from one's own locale is linked to the problematic aspects of individualism and seems to rely on liberalism's problem with embodiment versus abstraction that disproportionately affects women (Anderson, A. 1998: 267). I argue that it this is a misconception. I suggest that action of rejecting the expectation of 'the same constellation above us' not only respects the difference of the other, but also reduces the abstraction of the situated individual facing the other. Detachment is not disembodiment; if that word must be used, for the critical cosmopolitan it is the attempt to relate to the other by trying to 'walk in their shoes'. That platitude necessitates the temporary letting go of one's own experiences in order to be open to another's different experiences, with the expectation that some differences will often be incommensurable.

Sznaider's statement opens up the questions of what detachment and reflective distance might be from a critical cosmopolitan perspective. Hall describes simultaneous attachment and detachment as a common existential political position, where belonging and individuation continuously coexist:

> Now you cannot have all the equality or all the difference but you can have programmes and strategies of self-government and of governments in general, of the provisions of resources, which are sensitive to the double demand of equality and difference. You can have societies that recognize the importance of community and culture at the same time as acknowledging the liberal limit on communitarianism—that is to say the right of individuals to say no to the cultures they think should continue to exit while maintaining their communities' viability. This should not be so surprising because for most of us cosmopolitanism has involved and has a continued relationship to our family cultures. You think they are tremendously important, you would not dream of being bound by them any longer, you prize the moment when you left them but you know that as you leave them they continue to support you. They continue to be what you are. You could not be what you are without that struggle both to defend them and to exit from them. So, though this is not a

> logical political position, it is actually an existential political position we all perfectly well understand (2002: 30).

He describes what he observes (and experiences) as the importance of our local attachments to cosmopolitans. It does not preclude reflective distance, and a cosmopolitan worldview does not translate to abstract detachment. What continues to be critiqued is the degree to which particularity is compatible with normative cosmopolitanism's universality. Detachment implies the abstract individual, which generally does not indicate a tolerance for particularity. But cosmopolitanism's 'reflective distance' is aimed specifically *towards* the particularity of the other, and like the attachment/detachment that Hall acknowledges, it is not in opposition to situatedness. Appiah's engagement with the strangers is 'always going to be engagement with particular strangers' (Appiah 2006: 98). It has movement and direction, and the direction is the other. It moderates the continuum of, not an opposition between, particularity and universality. Furthermore, it does not presume that negotiating difference will result in commonality or agreement. And in this sense, Mehta's interpretation is political.

To Pheng Cheah, cosmopolitanism is more than simply dependent on reason as the basis for rights and obligations, but it is the key to its transcendent ethos:

> The term's philosophical usage to indicate a 'citizen of the universe', however, emphasizes that this intellectual ethos or spirit is not one of rootlessness. Instead, what is imagined is a universal circle of belonging that involves the transcendence of the particularistic and blindly given ties of kinship and country. The cosmopolitan therefore embodies the universality of philosophical reason itself, namely its power of transcending the particular and contingent. Hence, the popular view of cosmopolitanism as an elite form of rootlessness and a state of detachment and nomadic non-belonging is mistaken. The cosmopolitan's universal circle of belonging embraces the whole of humanity. (Cheah 2006a: 487; see also Anderson, A. 1998: 267)

What Cheah describes does indeed seem rootless and abstract: that we do not have a coherent, universal understanding of 'humanity', and it is thus understandable why so many are unable to 'feel the pull' of those ties. Cheah also points out that this perspective was promoted by certain French Enlightenment intellectuals since philosophers of the time 'could not envision feasible political structures for the regular and widespread institutionalization of mass-based cosmopolitan feeling' (2006a: 487). To him, 'the bonds of humanity, whether they are predicated in terms of reason or moral sentiment, may be the strongest possible ties.

Cheah may be right, and his point about the origins of cosmopolitan detachment is an illuminating one. However, his framing of the citizen of the universe remains so abstract and

detached that his claim, that the strongest possible ties may be the bonds of humanity, is difficult to realise. It is not simply about rebutting transcendence. It is also about proving that cosmopolitanism can be grounded and rooted. Hollinger offers a more material understanding.

> The human need for solidarities smaller than the species… is primal. The drive for belonging is more than an atavism to be renounced by all mature selves, and it is not easily detached from politics. The challenge is to take realistic account of the ethnos as well as of the species, and to assess existing and potential solidarities according to their capacity as a viable instrument of democratic-egalitarian values… Cosmopolitanism shares with universalism a suspicion of enclosures, but the cosmopolitan understands the necessity of enclosures in their capacity as contingent and provisionally bounded domains in which people can form intimate and sustaining relationships, and can indeed create diversity'. (Hollinger 2001: 238, 239)

Appiah, Hall, and Hollinger express the groundedness that is part of cosmopolitanism for many theorists. It is, in a sense, the universality/particularity issue. Reflective distance and rootedness are not opposed, but integral to each other.

Abstraction and the definition of humanity

Mignolo recognises that the question of who is human leads to the gendering of nations, and the exclusions nation is built upon (see Chapter Five):

> The fact that the "person" is Kant's beginning and reference point is already indicative of the presuppositions implied in the universal neutral imaginary that for him constitutes the person. Kant obviously was not thinking about the Amerindians, the Africans, or the Hindus as paradigmatic examples of his characterization. "Person" was for Kant an empty signifier around which all differences may be accommodated and classified. Also, "person" is the unit upon which sexes and nations are built. (Gregor 1993: 50–75) (Mignolo 2000: 734)

The category of human, which one might use as a baseline for assessing a commonality between people, has repeatedly served to exclude women, sexual dissidents, and ethnic minorities (Butler 2000: 39-40; Nussbaum 1999: 39; Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000: 581). I argued in Chapter Three that there is always the issue of representation in the meaning of autonomy and the individual and the question of who is speaking for whom. In normative cosmopolitan theory, the question of representation is usually referred to only tangentially. The universality/particularity opposition theoretically prevents universality from historicising and specifying the conditions different people and groups are subject to, and it is thus rejected by many feminist and postcolonial theorists. Universalism is perceived as false: useful for those in positions of dominance who declare an ethic to be universal, but in actuality rooted in the particular.

Consequent to this opposition, the frequently-called-for cosmopolitan capacity for reflective distance from one's own locale and affiliations is greeted with some suspicion, for it appears to be based on the Kantian transcendental, abstract man I discussed in Chapter Three. The implication here is that with enough 'reflective distance' we might all find our common values from which to judge. For communitarianism and certain other theoretical positions, these are fatal flaws: universality is seen as antithetical to particularity, with no room to manoeuvre, and nothing to mitigate its hegemony and uniformity:

> The individualism of universal principles forgets that every person is a world and comes into existence in common with others, that we are all in community. Being in common is an integral part of being self: self is exposed to the other, it is posed in exteriority, the other is part of the intimacy of self. Before me comes the (m)other. I am I because the other and language has called me 'you', "Costas"'. (Douzinas 2007b: 3)

It is an interesting statement, exposing the somewhat circular nature of the universal/particular binary. What is universal is that people come 'into existence in common' with the others in their lives, and that there is no universal individual model—no character traits common to all, no explicit values one can presuppose about anyone else.

Douzinas sees the history of human rights as an 'ongoing and always failing struggle to close the gap between the abstract man and the concrete citizen; to add flesh, blood and sex to the pale outline of the "human"' (2007a: 54). Without allowing for the interdependence of universality and particularity, abstract universalism runs the risk of losing a sense of individual embodiment, expressing the paradoxical liberal individualism it produces. Especially as it applies to the obligations nations have as bearers of (international) human rights, abstraction tends to obliterate our need and weaken our capacity, not only to comprehend difference in others, but also to comprehend the implications of those differences. Sznaider notes that universalism demands respect between others as 'a matter of principle', but that very same demand inhibits 'curiosity or respect for what makes others different. On the contrary, the particularity of others is sacrificed to an assumption of universal equality (Sznaider 2007: 112-113). But if one takes up Appiah's approach that the stranger is always particular, that sacrifice may not be inevitable.

The rethinking of the Rights of Man as a basis for the contemporary conception of human rights might well be secondary to the idea of humanity as a given. Douzinas suggests that stripping away the essentialist trappings of humanity is precisely what would reveal human rights as 'highly artificial constructs, a historical accident of European intellectual and political history' (2007a: 55). It is perhaps a more realistic approach to defining what it means to be human. He

theorises that the rights belong to 'the symbolic order of language and law, which determines their scope and reach with scant regard for ontologically solid categories, like those of man, human nature or dignity', and believes that 'human' and 'humanity' in those contexts are 'floating signifier[s]', discursive and empty of particular meaning.

Douzinas goes further and describes just how malleable the definition of humanity has been, and always will be, basically agreeing with Arendt: 'What history has taught us is that there is nothing sacred about any definition of humanity and nothing eternal about its scope. No common "factor X" exists' (Douzinas 2007a: 54).

Whilst the concept of humanity may be the most obviously contingent, the tangential concepts of moral worth and dignity are also areas of contention. Douzinas contests what he sees as the 'entrenchment' of the cosmopolitan notion of equal dignity and moral worth. Regarding the effort to see the humanity in 'inhuman others' (a word often used to describe deplorable behaviour), he states that '… it is precisely the absolutisation of local moralities and their equation with humanity that creates the inhuman others' (2007a: 175).

Although they agree on the problem abstraction poses, this may be a point of departure from Arendt's cosmopolitanism. She writes, 'Man, it turns out, can lose all so-called Rights of Man without losing his essential quality as man, his human dignity. Only the loss of a polity itself expels him from humanity' (1968: 297). Arendt may make the polity the condition for dignity, but she still considers 'the intrinsic quality of being human as having dignity rather than rights that could be stripped away at any moment: the right to have rights is guaranteed because of dignity', an interpretation Ranjana Khanna describes as 'unmistakeably Kantian' (Khanna, R. 2007: 263). According to Kant, we are all thinking human beings, granted by the mere fact of our species that we can reason. But Arendt also stated (as a fact) that 'men, not Man, live on the earth and inhabit the world' ([1958] 1998: 7). Whether practical or pure, Kant's reason is still abstract: he is still dealing with Man, and not Arendt's men.

Dignity and reason

'… perhaps the real debate on cosmopolitan universality pits the philosophical against the political' (Benhabib, Waldron et al. 2006: 20).

Normative cosmopolitan theorists understand cosmopolitan universalism to be based on Kant's notion of equal moral worth (as well as the human capacity for reason) because 'people's equal moral worth generates moral reasons that are binding to everyone' (Caney 2001: 976-977). In

this chapter I have argued that liberal moral universals are based on abstractions, false neutralities, and opaque particularities. Critical cosmopolitans continue to debate what possible universals might be, and what they might be based on, if not reason.

Noted above, Arendt claims the intrinsic dignity of humankind and plurality as the condition for the polity that makes rights possible. Kant's association of dignity with reason makes dignity suspect in the eyes of some theorists. Khanna prefers the goal of postcolonial feminism to be justice rather than dignity, as dignity is conceptualised by Kant. She believes that through such a liberal interpretation, 'we will have arrived at a notion of dignity as a secularized soul through the formula of autonomy' (based on Augustine's Christian conception of the soul) (Khanna, R. 2007: 262). Formulated through the Kantian conception of autonomy, it is hence abstract and vague. We may know indignity when we see it, but that does not tell us what dignity is. For Khanna, Arendt's dependence of the right to have rights based on dignity is fatally flawed, because we do not have a clear conception of what that dignity is.

The idea of human dignity is arguably not available for recuperation by interpreting it as an empty signifier, despite the 'bare freedom' assignment Nussbaum gives it (Nussbaum 2008: 88). It has been codified by both German and Israeli law ('inviolable right' and 'fundamental moral ideal and right', respectively), and by the UDHD ('the basis for freedom and justice in the world') (Cornell and Muvangua 2011: 7, 386). In all of these cases, dignity remains an abstraction based on Western understandings of 'autonomy and personhood', as Khanna understands it (Khanna, R. 2007: 262).

Cornell's work has involved constitutionalising Ubuntu in South Africa. She contrasts Kant's abstract notion of dignity with Ubuntu, which is associated with 'communalism and such virtues as loyalty and generosity' (ibid.). Those concepts are more substantive, yet still open-ended. The reason for the comparison is not immediately obvious, given that communalism, loyalty and generosity do not immediately bring to mind autonomy and dignity. Cornell explains that if we understand Ubuntu as 'the ethical law of the new South Africa then it would be Ubuntu that would ground the constitutional Grundnorm[41] of dignity and not dignity that calls for the re-cognition of African humanist principles such as Ubuntu' (Cornell 2010: 3-4).

[41] Cornell states that Grundnorm is 'Hans Kelsen's word for the grounding moral or ethical principle that undergirds not only the legal system but the society as a whole' (Cornell 2010: 3-4).

In other words, in South Africa, Ubuntu is what grounds dignity in law and society, and not vice versa. Cornell describes Ubuntu as rejecting the abstract notion of dignity, yet retaining a generality that can be useful to South African law. It is the harmony, and not the opposition of, the individual and the community as enabling each other. It is, perhaps, similar in spirit to Hall's understanding of family and community as inescapable even as we leave them. Ubuntu is not without its problems. As quasi-religious belief system, it has the potential for marginalising those who do not subscribe to it. In addition, despite the deep integration of individual and community as co-enabling, South Africa is not a country without violence. However, it is a colonised country with colonial and postcolonial problems that a belief system will not easily overcome. Further, Ubuntu is unlike a religion such as Christianity precisely because does not require an adherence to religious beliefs, but stems from community culture and norms rather than deities and promises of an afterlife. It is deeply embedded in indigenous communities in southern Africa, but its integration into the greater nation state of South Africa has been difficult, even as politicians and others use it as a catchphrase for South African racial harmony. Still, as a living system of how community and the individual are not in opposition, in contrast to Western autonomy ideals, it is perhaps a helpful model for comparison.

As I argued in Chapter Three, care and justice are not mutually exclusive, and Cornell claims in fact that they 'are not separable'. Ubuntu is an example of how they can be understood as complementary and intertwined. Care does not have a firm place in liberal law, but it is integral to how one respects another according to Ubuntu—not in an abstract sense, but in a material sense, and about the singularity of the individual in relation to community (2010: 4). Here she finds that feminist notions of care and justice have much in common with Ubuntu.

> Ubuntu is materialised in ethical actions… More specifically, it's materialised in the struggles of individuals in conflict. This enactment of ubuntu materialises a more humane world. There are several philosophical points to be made here, important to debates in Anglo-American and western European feminism: care and dignity, or care and justice are not separable. To respect the dignity of the person is to respect them in their singularity and in their material existence, not to respect them in their abstract [inaudible]. And this respect will change its demands in regard to the circumstances (Cornell 2009: 43:20).

She notes that feminists have been critical of the idea that freedom is an individual attribute. Like Arendt's notion of freedom as a social enactment, exercised in concert and dependent on modes of belonging, Ubuntu does not see freedom as something an individual 'has'. It has similarities to O'Neill's suggestion that perhaps obligations should come before rights. I quote at length here because this passage crystallises the Ubuntu conception of mutuality.

> In ubuntu human beings are intertwined in a world of ethical relations and obligations from the time they are born. The social bond, then, is not imagined as one of separate individuals. This inscription by the other is fundamental in that we are born into a language, a kinship group, a tribe, a nation. But this inscription is not simply reduced to a social fact. We come into the world obligated to others, and in turn these others are obligated to us, to the individual. Thus, it is a profound misunderstanding of *ubuntu* to confuse it with simple-minded communitarianism. It is only through the engagement and support of others that we are able to realise a true individuality and rise above our biological distinctiveness into a fully developed person whose uniqueness is inseparable from the journey to moral and ethical development (Cornell and Muvangua 2011: 3).

Cornell states that 'in South Africa, Kant has been explicitly incorporated into constitutional jurisprudence' and that Kantianism has been defended there 'as one important secular justification for the understanding of dignity as an ideal attribution of persons such that all persons have intrinsic worth' (2010: 4). That statement is not contrary to Khanna's objection to dignity as the basis for equal moral worth and rights. But Cornell begins with Kant and then departs. She maintains that Kant's notions of dignity and moral worth are not, in fact, contradictory to the more material and substantive ideas that Ubuntu is based on. Kant argues that our dignity is 'inextricably associated with our capacity for reason. The social bond… still begins with imagined individuals' (Cornell 2010: 12). The point of departure for Cornell is Ubuntu's understanding of dignity and respect over Kantian dignity, specifically because Ubuntu's notion of dignity is not tied to the capacity to reason. One effect is that dignity is not withdrawn through the inevitable loss of that capacity (through age or illness)—unlike it would be according to Kantian logic. Dignity, moral worth, and respect are all based on the fact that all people are born human, and what that implies. Not all human beings have the capacity or the ability to reason. Those who are born severely intellectually disabled, or have suffered serious head injuries, or experience severe dementia through age or disease may not be at all self-determining or able to reason in any sense. Do they exist outside the purviews of cosmopolitanism and human rights because of that inability to reason? If the universalisms that human rights are based on insist on rationality, logically those individuals are not subject to the protection of those rights. Most societies have some mechanism, to greater and lesser degrees, for taking care of such individuals. But what rights do they have through global justice if the notion of the individual is based on the ability to reason?

> The intrinsic worth of a human being, which justifies an egalitarian ethic, is not based as it is in Kant because that being has the potential to act in accordance with the dictates of pure reason. Nor is it because of who that individual is in his or her actual achievements (Cornell 2010: 16-17).

Unlike Arendt's understanding, according to Cornell, 'dignity can be violated even as it remains the basis of our moral worth, because as creatures that have at least the possibility of moral action' we share the *possibility* of bringing about 'a new beginning' (2010: 7). That dignity, then, can be violated but never lost, that it is actionable, and that it calls for a respect that is dependent on circumstance, appears to be a universalism that is both Kantian and not abstract. And it is derived from Ubuntu's belief that 'I am, because of you'—an idea very similar to Arendt's global plurality and Butler's sociality.[42]

Although Ubuntu may represent an opportunity to think through dignity and respect as they apply to rights differently, there are still aspects of rights that need to be addressed more urgently if their association with cosmopolitanism is to be viable. Mignolo's 'colonial difference' process would move concepts like human rights and humanity out of the abstract and into Arendt's political. Douzinas contends that the Rights of Man were meant to be just that: they were a kind of codification of what powerful men at the time felt they were entitled to, condensing in their identities 'the abstract dignity of humanity and the real prerogatives of belonging to the community of the powerful' (2007a: 54). For him, there is a dire need for human rights to be uncoupled from 'global neo-liberal capitalism and human-rights-for-export', which he sees as 'part of the same project', and which leads directly not only to poverty, but violence (2007a: 293). Similar to Zerilli's, Cornell's work elaborates on Ubuntu's integration of singularity and interdependence that goes beyond the abstract universal/particular binary. These similar approaches to the seemingly paradoxical impossibility and necessity of universality offer ways of rethinking the basic cosmopolitan concepts as integrated and evolving rather than atomistic and static. It is my contention that reconceptualising them through these approaches may lead to a more coherent, egalitarian cosmopolitanism.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have interrogated cosmopolitan universalism and examined a number of the problems it poses to people who are not part of normative discourses and the different positions various theorists take on them. I have analysed different resolutions to the problems some theorists have put forth. There are overlaps between the moderate normative and critical theorists, but conceptions of what universalism is, and what it means to cosmopolitan theory, differ widely.

[42] See Bishop Desmond Tutu's site at http://www.tutufoundationuk.org/ubuntu.php .

I argue that the best way forward for cosmopolitanism's ambivalent relationship to universalism may be in stepping away from the philosophical/moral approach to it and conceptualise it as a political process, as suggested by Benhabib, Butler and Arendt, and incorporating Hutchings feminist discourse ethics (which includes work by Spivak and Butler). Arendt's 'representative thinking' is complementary to that work. Mignolo's suggestion to change the 'relativism' discourse to 'colonial discourse' is not only useful in reducing reactivity to charges, but reminds us what the deeper intentions are in many of these relativism charges. One starting point might be a concerted effort to 'venture beyond the existing political vocabularies' (Hall 2002: 30). We need to reconceptualise certain binaries as interdependent and integral to each other, rather than oppositional: universality/particularity, equality/difference, and rooted/detached.

Many of the problems universalism presents are rooted in a liberal understanding of the key concepts, such as the individual, freedom, human rights and others. In reconceiving these concepts, there is the possibility of recuperation. At its core, the universalised understanding of the individual as atomistic and transcendent does not serve a reconstructed cosmopolitanism well. The success of human rights remains a site of contention because the notion of who is human is not universal. However, many theorists acknowledge a need for some form of universalism. As with autonomy, one can theorise universality as relational. Our universalism, in Arendt's view, is plurality, 'the condition of human action because we are all the same, that is, human, in such a way that nobody is ever the same as anyone else who has ever lived, lives, or will live' (Arendt [1958] 1998: 8). It is the point she makes on cohabitation and the heterogeneity of life, and it is where Butler recognises that this is how universality must be acknowledged. More precisely, Butler, in addressing the problems of universality in cosmopolitanism, prefers Arendt's 'pre-liberal, pre-contract' conception of plurality to describe a more politicised cosmopolitanism based not on Kantian reason, but on difference and particularity as universal to humanity (Butler 2010: 47:10).

Arendt's notion of the human condition is 'the basic conditions under which life on earth has been given to man' (Arendt [1958] 1998: 7). What constitutes the human condition, and in particular how (her notion of) plurality and alterity are basic to them, would seem to be a more useful interrogation for a reformulated cosmopolitan theory than the more common, liberal notion of universality. That notion presupposes the atomistic individual and attempts to universalise certain basic liberal principles of justice that emerged from Western thought—a problematic endeavour even when they exist as universals in other cultures.

Her ideas on the plurality of humankind, and the impossibility of exiting that plurality, is one way forward. She and Butler advocate politicising the idea of human rights, with Butler's urging that, the universals they are based upon, stay open - interpreted and negotiated. They must, because the adjudication of the universal and the particular is always political. She understands misinterpretation and reformulation as part of the ongoing critique of universals. Hutchings' feminist discourse ethics, primarily based on Spivak's and Young's theories on communication, 'learning to learn' in negotiating with the other, and group participation, gives us guidelines on how to approach those negotiations. Zerilli maintains that feminists must accept the necessity of judging as part of negotiating with the other (Zerilli 2009).

Finally, as Cornell argues in her work, Ubuntu and Kant provides a tenuous bridge between normative and critical perspectives, with Ubuntu supplying us with a material way of reconceiving plurality, mutuality, and interdependence. Although it is not usually framed as a concept through which political negotiation of universalisms can take place, it is useful as a way of thinking through that process that is material and based on useful conceptualisations of dignity and equal moral worth. Perhaps more importantly, Ubuntu gives us one kind of representation of the relationship between the individual and the community as mutually beneficial rather than oppositional.

Chapter Five Overview

In previous chapters I interrogated forms of autonomy and universalism in order to determine what reformulations might be possible to make them compatible with this project's goal of a more relational, intersubjective, critical cosmopolitanism that accounts for the social. The cosmopolitan position is commonly framed as anti-nationalist. This approach establishes the theory's frame for obligations to others in the international context, because cosmopolitanism dismisses or reduces the idea that moral obligations towards compatriots take priority over others. Nationalism may not always be entirely at odds with cosmopolitanism, however, as some moderate theorists maintain that certain forms of patriotism or nationalism are compatible with it and perhaps even necessary. This chapter examines the validity of that claim. In this chapter, then, I use Pogge's third tenet of cosmopolitanism –'generality'–to interrogate the tensions between nationalism and cosmopolitanism.

I argue that 1) nationalism has a complex and problematic relationship to cosmopolitanism that is not easily resolved within the constraints of the nation state; 2) an understanding of how the marginalisations on which national identities depend are directly tied to broader meanings of nation, and are complicit with othering those outside the nation state's borders; and 3) cosmopolitanism's conflicted position on nationalism is better served by incorporating that understanding in line with the concept's rejection of identity as criterion for determining who deserves the protection of principles of justice. I use a number of insightful theorists focusing on the foundations of nationalism, the nation state order, and cosmopolitanism's relationship to nationalism. The most constructive of these theorists are Enloe, Anne McClintock, Puri, and Beck.

In conclusion, I argue that because nationalism and its attendant nationalist identity appear to be inherently exclusive they are not compatible with cosmopolitanism despite the nation state being the global order of population organisation. They should be resisted and cosmopolitanism should retain its anti-nationalist position as one of its core components in a reworked theory.

Chapter Five: Nationalism

'Identity, always identity, over and above knowing about others.' (Said 1994: 299)

Introduction

I begin this chapter with Pogge's third tenet, *generality*.

- *Generality*: this special status has global force. Persons are ultimate units of concern *for everyone* (1992 48-49).

I have argued that Pogge's three tenets correspond to the three necessary components of cosmopolitanism: autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism. *Generality* corresponds to anti-nationalism because the coverage of 'global force' being for 'everyone' challenges absolute nation state sovereignty. In other words, if the principles of justice determine that the human right to freedom of assembly applies to everyone, no nation state has the right to overrule that right and prohibit any of its inhabitants from assembling peacefully. Simply put, their sovereignty does not extend to transgressing globally recognised human rights.

There are implications to this claim that go beyond the challenge to absolute national sovereignty. Whilst normative cosmopolitan theorists may agree with that basic claim, they rarely deconstruct the foundations of nationalism and national identity, which I argue is necessary if cosmopolitanism is to resist repeating the problems of liberal nationalism. These foundations occur within the nation state and are dependent on the exclusion and marginalisation of the other within national borders; without this understanding, cosmopolitanism cannot challenge international nationalisms adequately.

Even within nationalism debates, there lies the general conflict in the widespread belief that nationalism and national identity provide something powerful and good for the people of a nation, yet have the capacity for violence against those who do not take part. The conundrum is that:

> On the one hand, it serves to bind people to the place that they regard as their national homeland; it encourages them to cooperate and to protect their more vulnerable compatriots; and it gives them a sense of controlling their own destiny. On the other hand, it is liable to generate indifference or even hostility towards outsiders; incoming groups who do not already share the national identity may have difficulty in integrating; and it has

> destabilizing effects when political borders and national borders fail to coincide. (Miller 2006: 544)

The dangers Miller describes above are some of the detrimental 'othering' aspects of national identity that I am convinced are directly opposed to cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitan theory recognises nationalism's exclusionary aspect on an international level, and counters with the acceptance of, rather than the rejection of difference between peoples of nations, states, and ethnicities. This othering takes place on a political level, marking the difference between citizens with prioritised allegiances, or non-citizens with fewer rights and protections; and it takes place on a more psychoanalytic level, in the sense of Julia Kristeva's subject who recognises (or fails to) the stranger within (Kristeva 1991). Nationalism is frequently is frequently invoked to justify differential treatment of others. It is often deemed antithetical to cosmopolitanism because cosmopolitanism's primary assertion is that all people have the same moral worth and equal dignity, regardless of borders, boundaries and identities (Appiah 1998: 94; Beitz 2005: 11, 17; Pogge 2002: 169).

Yet an equally important othering occurs within the nation state as well. Miller recognises this to some degree when he discusses the problem of integrating 'incoming groups'. The process of conceptualising nation requires the exclusion of those who do not comply with sexuality, gender, or race norms. This is often achieved by imposing vectors of difference that organize and identify people as deviant or privileged subjects within nationalist discourse. Within the context of human rights, cosmopolitan theorists do recognise internal discrimination against those who are categorised as a threat to the nation, but this tends to occur on a case-by-case basis (in the treatment of political dissidents) or during a genocide (Rwanda's Hutu and Tutsi conflict). I argue here that what appears to be missing in normative cosmopolitan theory is the understanding of how nationalism is *dependent* on marginalisation and opposition, on difference as deviance, on those who are not part of the nationalist discourse. Gendered and sexual hierarchies are not simply aberrant aspects of nationalism but rather foundational to it. So too, and as Puri argues, nationalism is always gendered and raced, and gender and race are constitutive parts of 'its beliefs and practices' (2004: 107, 110). So far, debates in the field regarding such fundamental problems of nation have been limited in frequency and scope; they rarely acknowledge the interconnected social exclusions that, if acknowledged at all, are assumed to be *incidental* to nationalism, rather than underlying it. Further, I will be explore way in which these seemingly internal issues are in fact complicit in nationalist hegemonies on the

global level too. The reputation of cosmopolitanism as elitist and/or imperialist is reinforced because of this failure to address the marginalising oppositions upon which nationalism is built.

It is surprising, then, that the field's normative theorists have not problematised nationalism in that direction to a greater extent, as doing so would bolster the basic cosmopolitan argument and address the charges that it is merely liberalism without borders, with liberalism's attendant problems. These oppositions and the identification of those labelled as different disproportionately affect the disadvantaged, those who do not have the privilege of travel, and those who are not considered 'cosmopolitan' in the vernacular sense of the word. Without addressing these issues, cosmopolitan support for any kind of nationalism threatens to retain and reproduce such exclusions.

Despite the frequent essentialism of the oppositions stated above, they are mutable, and progress has certainly been made. Consider, for example, LGBT rights, particularly the right to marry and the right to serve in the military, and the ways these test nationalist heteronormativity. In the US, both issues have evolved substantially since 2000. Yet a key part of the control nationalism exerts involves the complicity of those most constrained by it. Hence many queer people continue to vote for representatives who are against LGBT rights (such as marriage) because they feel those representatives better serve their financial concerns. Similarly, women have always been a major part of the anti-abortion movement, rejecting self-determination for the rewards of heteronormative femininity. Political climates change, thus do the reasons for exclusions. In the US, women were denied abortion rights until the court case *Roe v Wade* in 1972. In the last twenty years, those rights have been drastically reduced, and are close to be revoked altogether at the time of writing. But the curtailing of women's rights will not end there. In concert with the campaign to repeal abortion rights is the drive to outlaw some of the most common forms of contraception. Controlling women, as I will argue later in this chapter, is a primary mode of nationalism.

The apparent gap in the normative branch's analyses on nationalist discourses can be associated with its Enlightenment understanding of cosmopolitanism's two other basic components: autonomy and universalism. In the previous two chapters, I set out arguments for rethinking these two concepts through contemporary critical works that go some way towards answering the charges of imperialism and elitism (Jazeel 2011; Werbner 1999: 18). Those theorists' critiques of those liberal conceptions and they can be helpful here in problematising nationalism in ways normative cosmopolitanism has not. I noted earlier, too, that there is value in allowing

different strains of cosmopolitanism to develop. Numerous theorists have recognised the multiplicity of cosmopolitanisms and many are content with letting these various versions co-exist (Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000: 584; Binnie and Skeggs 2004: 41). This is not to suggest cosmopolitan theory should remain as underspecified as it today; however, it does leave room for differing opinions on the nationalism continuum (which includes patriotism and jingoism) for resolving the problems of marginalisation without contradicting its core values, and for opening up debates between normative and critical theorists on how to address the gaps discussed in this chapter.

Terminology and positions

Many of the key terms in this chapter are highly contested. For example, what defines a nation and what differences there might be between nationalism and patriotism are both controversial issues, so it is worthwhile to outline their use in the context of this chapter. These are general guidelines on how I am using these terms, particularly at the start. In discussing these different interpretations, I will be interrogating various positions on nationalism.

Nation / nation-state / nation state

As Appiah explains, the original 'yoking' together of the 'nation-state' during the Enlightenment 'was intended to bring the arbitrary boundaries of states into conformity with the "natural" boundaries of nations' (Appiah 1998: 96). If it was ever the case, nations and states do not presently conform to geography in the 21st century: colonialism, particularly in parts of Africa and the Middle East, has resulted in disparate and often-opposing (usually on ethnic and/or religious grounds) groups forced into one state, under one government that may or may not represent all of those groups. 'Nation' and 'nation-state' are often used interchangeably, though when a high degree of sovereignty is present, 'nation-state' would be the more proper term. Nenad Miscevic's definition and example are interesting here because he ties the state to sovereignty and national identity. He gives the example of the Native American Iroquois people as constituting a nation, but not a sovereign state because they do not have political authority over their own internal (or external) affairs (2010).

Cynthia Enloe's more visual conception is to describe the state as 'a vertical creature of authority', and a nation as 'a horizontal creature of identity', which is a useful distinction (Enloe 1989: 46). Not all nations strive for statehood, of course. Cherokee and Iroquois national pride are forms of nationalism, regardless of those groups' positions on sovereignty. Others are more

obvious in their pursuit of national sovereignty: Serbian and Croatian nationalists (amongst others) emerged at the breakdown of the Yugoslavian state in 1991 to form sovereign states, but their nationalism preceded that event.

Miller's complex discussion of nation and identity is worth introducing in some detail here. 'It is first of all a group with a common identity; belonging to the nation is partially constitutive of the identity of each member' ('partially' because Miller acknowledges the multiplicity of identities). According to him, a nation is a group of people who feel they belong together because of what they share in common. Second, the group shares a 'public culture, a set of understandings about how their collective life should be led, including principles that set the terms of their political association…' (Miller 2007: 124-125). He maintains that this does not exclude 'significant cultural differences among subgroups'—a point of contention between communitarianism's nationalism and multiculturalism. His third point is that 'nations are groups whose members recognise special obligations to one another' (ethical, not instrumental); and fourth, that members regard its continued existence 'as a valuable good', such that if the benefits the nation provided were to be fulfilled by other entities, the loss of the nation would still be considered 'horrific'. Miller also distinguishes between nationality and citizenship. One can conceivably embrace one's citizenship, but not be a nationalist; and, if we consider Miscevic's sovereignty factor, we frame citizenship more in terms of the relationship to the state than to the nation.

Enloe is partly in agreement with Miller, but has a slightly different emphasis. She includes the presence of otherness as a crucial aspect of nationalism. Enloe suggests that nationalism fosters that otherness, but she does not include state sovereignty as a necessity.[43] Her focus on otherness here is within and around the nation, i.e. on people in 'other' groups:

> A 'nation' is a collection of people who have come to believe that they have been shaped by a common past and are destined to share a common future. That belief is usually nurtured by a common language and a sense of otherness from groups around them. Nationalism is a commitment to fostering those beliefs and promoting policies which permit the nation to control its own destiny. (Enloe 1989: 45)

Different conceptions of nation are understandable, for there is no single narrative of the nation (McClintock 1995: 360). Nation is experienced differently geographically, and historically—the history of a nation being a key part of its national identity, with interpretations of that history

[43] Her definition, and how she chooses to unlink 'nation state' by removing the hyphen is closer to Jyoti Puri's, as noted in Chapter Two. And as noted there, I un-hyphenate 'nation state' in my own usage.

and that identity changing over time. It is safe to say, however, that all nations are gendered, if gendered differently. How nationalism is implicated in gender power remains an undertheorised issue by nearly all male theorists, the result being that nationalisms 'typically have sprung from masculinized memory, masculinized humiliation and masculinized hope' (Enloe in McClintock 1995: 353).

What is also clear is the nation state's need for controlling its populace, and that sexuality is a primary site of regulation. Puri states that 'the nation and state help enforce social regulation by defining what is normal' and they do so by *exposing* the deviant and abnormal, 'rather than repressing sexuality' (2004: 153). This is a key factor in analysing social marginalisations and understanding why nationalism is dependent on them, which I discuss below.

Onora O'Neill observes that for some, the most compelling reason for the existence of the nation state is the political environment it supports and the rights it guarantees (O'Neill 2000: 180). The UDHR is in agreement that states bear the main responsibility for upholding rights, but O'Neill finds that argument unpersuasive, and that the reality is that it the nation state is a 'fundamentally anti-cosmopolitan institution' (2000: 180-181). She agrees with Arendt that states bear the responsibility for upholding rights, but because of their continuing failure to do so for everyone, citizens and non-citizens alike, she is unconvinced that the nation state model is worthy of cosmopolitan investment (2000: 181).

Each of these theorists has contributed valuable insights into the problem of the nation state. Miscevic's distinction between nation and nation state is helpful in understanding the virtual aspect of nation. Miller's critical features of nation are useful in providing context for the investigation of nationalism and identity, as are his deductions on how nationalism is constructive. Enloe's emphasis on otherness and nationalism is important to understanding how colonialism results in different kinds of nationalism, and more importantly here, how otherness works within the nation. Puri's linkage between the nation and deviance is critical to how we think through the relationship between nationalism and national identity. And O'Neill asks the more precise question of why cosmopolitanism should support such an anti-cosmopolitan institution and, critically here, notes that historically states' records on upholding rights even within the nation state are weak.

Nationalism

Although cosmopolitanism has always had an anti-nationalist bent, the term 'nationalism' can cover a wide range on the spectrum of civic or ethnic loyalties. This spectrum can run from an arguably benign patriotism, to the more or less strident middle ground of general nationalism, and into hostile ethnocentrism or jingoism. Some theorists posit that there are significant differences between patriotism and nationalism and that it is these differences that make patriotism more compatible with cosmopolitanism (Appiah 1998; Miller 2006: 532; Kleingeld 2000; Nussbaum 2008). I address the relevance of these distinctions later in this chapter.

Puri argues that nationalism is a form of power and an expression of power: it is unifying, and can inspire people to give up their lives in its name, a position Miller would agree with. It is used to unite people against a common enemy and it can also be used to persuade people that foreign or national actions are just or unjust (Puri 2004: 5). In this sense, it can be framed as benign or neutral, and its value is in how it is used, thereby leading some theorists to believe nationalism can be wielded positively.

George Mosse thought of nationalism as 'perhaps the most powerful and effective ideology of modern times' partly because it was joined up with the growing middle classes in the 19th and 20th centuries (1985: 9). Mosse focused his conceptualisations of nationalism on the idea that it regulated the population through its own notions of respectability in modern England and Germany, revealing how the linkages worked to control the populace. His usage of respectability is about conformity; in essence, it delineates the normal and the deviant. Respectability needs deviance to define what it is *not*, thereby defining what it *is* through exclusion. The combined forces 'assigned everyone his place in life, man and woman, normal and abnormal, native and foreigner, any confusion between these categories threatened chaos and loss of control' (1985: 16). Deviation from these norms identified those who were marginalised, and, in the process, those who rightfully 'belonged' (to the nation or the state, and any groups within it). Mosse saw that whilst the otherness of the foreigner is one aspect of nationalism, another was its stratifying power within the nation.

Puri agrees, stating that '[s]ameness and difference are the foundations upon which nationalism rests: individuals in a nation are essentially similar and equal, but each nation and its people are distinct from others', and that nationalism dictates what people can do within the state (2004: 2-3). She notes that many believe nationalism is what helps people 'realize our potential as individuals… in that, nationalism conjoins our individuality to the collective'. Miller concurs

with that position, but as a liberal nationalist he goes further by maintaining that in a liberal state, liberal values can only be achieved through a shared national identity (2007: 536).

Nationalism in colonised countries is often portrayed as having somewhat different elements: namely, the motivation is the resistance to the coloniser. Whilst this may be true, the structural aspects—the oppositions and social hierarchies national identities are reliant on—are, in the broadest sense, the same. Returning to Miscevic's understanding of nationalism as either an attitude towards one's national identity or action directed towards achieving or sustaining political sovereignty (2010), I am particularly concerned with the effects of the one on the other. From a human rights perspective, this allows us to think through how recognition of nationalism's intranational hierarchies is a challenge to absolute national sovereignty.

National identity

National identity is at the core of nationalism. Always formed through exclusion, this can be problematic for any kind of identity; however, the exclusions resulting from nationalist identities can be particularly oppressive and dangerous. Though often framed as self-evident, national identity evolves according to the needs of nationalism and is dependent on internal social hierarchies. This is one explanation for why sexuality and race, in their different forms and contexts, remain integral parts of nationalism. These hierarchical marginalisations and exclusions serve to create and support national characteristics, symbols, and values. The use of identity here is in the singular, underscoring a common unique identity. The phrase, 'America, love it or leave it' frequently demanded of US anti-Vietnam war protesters in the 1960s made a comeback during the Iraq wars. It exemplifies the nationalist mood of the times, that one either identifies with the national stance on the war, or one is not welcome as part of the nation. As an ideology, there is an expectation that individuals yield to, or sacrifice, for the nation. President John F. Kennedy famously admonished, 'ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country' (Kennedy 1963: 238). This is in line with Miller's contention regarding responsibility.[44]

From an international relationships perspective, most theorists acknowledge that the most stable political systems are those 'in which state power rests on a bed of national identity: a "nation-

[44] '[N]ational identity entails national responsibility. By virtue of identifying with compatriots sharing their values, and receiving the benefits that national communities provide, we are also involved in collective responsibility for the things that nations do' (Miller 2007: 278).

state"' (Enloe 1989: 46). None of that appears problematic until we remember that national identity formation, as with citizenship, is by definition exclusionary: like all forms of identity, it is shaped through a complex opposition of who, and what, it is not (Appiah 1998: 106; Butler 1995a: 50; Hall 1996: 4-5). A key question, then, is whether or not nationalism is always implicit in nation. For me it cannot be otherwise, although I am agnostic on whether it nationalism is intrinsic to nation state formation, that 'expresses a certain national identity', as Butler and Gayatri Spivak suggest (2007: 30), or whether it forms and precedes it (Gellner in Nash 2003: 507). In either case, the expression of national identity is always nationalist and the nation state does not exist without nationalism, whether one sees it as positive, benign, or oppressive.

The unifying effect of national identity can be positive, and perhaps necessary, for certain kinds of collective processes. Like Miller, Roberta Coles understands national identity to be a collective or common identity that 'motivates participation and enables the formation of a common will and capacity for collective action' (2002: 587). She, however, is more concerned with this discursive process reproducing the othering common to all identity formations, and the way it results in 'stereotypical "us" and "them" conceptions' (2002: 589). The obvious opposition would be to the other side of the border, to other sovereign nations differentiating themselves through bordering from those who are not of that nation. The less obvious opposition that occurs within national borders is not usually framed in terms of nationalism, but of the binary of the deviant, or other, and the normative within the nation state.

Liberal (i.e. normative moral) cosmopolitan theory currently focuses more on internationally related issues of nationalism, leaving related problems *within* the state undertheorised. However, there may be no other major political theory based on democratic principles that problematises national borders and nationalism in the ways that addressing such inequalities require. Liberalism, communitarianism and civic republicanism are all, to varying degrees, willing to sacrifice some for the sake of others when the nation seems dependent on those sacrifices.[45] On the international stage, it is state sovereignty that legitimises prioritising compatriots over others. Within the state, it legitimises the hierarchies that produce basic meanings of nation on which

[45] This is true even of US liberal democracy, where the minority theoretically are protected from the tyranny of majority rule. In actuality this is not always the case: for example, the rights of gay, lesbian, and transgender individuals until recently were dismissed over the concerns of military cohesion or religious beliefs in the workplace.

national identity depends. The sovereign state is heavily invested in national identity as a mechanism for population control.

National identity's overt purpose is unity, based on an essentialisation of its different aspects, such as birthplace and ethnicity (Puri 2004: 214). In reality, these characteristics may be arbitrary, but by framing them as involuntary one is impelled to adopt the national identity as if it were inherent. For immigrants, in nationalistic countries like the US, those who naturalise are expected to take on the national identity with fervour, else they will be suspect and their loyalties questioned. It is a discursive, divisive process that produces a population whose national identities are dependent on their opposition to those who cannot or choose not to be part of that population.

Cosmopolitanism versus nationalism

For better or worse, there is a growing consensus that cosmopolitanism sometimes works together with nationalism rather than in opposition to it. It is thus less clear what cosmopolitanism is opposed to, or what its value is supposed to be (Robbins 1998a: 2).

Cosmopolitanism and nationalism have an uneasy relationship. At best, cosmopolitan theorists attempt some accommodation for local and state loyalties, and theorists defending nationalism acknowledge that the issue of global justice needs to be addressed. At worst, they are diametrically opposed. The nationalist position accuses cosmopolitanism of rootlessness and, in effect, disloyalty, and the cosmopolitan position accuses the nationalism continuum of 'a dangerous form of parochialism' (Kleingeld 2000: 313; see also Nussbaum 1996: 14-15).

However, various theorists from different perspectives now accept or advocate some form of patriotism as not inconsistent with cosmopolitanism's broader aims: indeed, Kant was a nationalist despite his role in bringing cosmopolitanism to the Enlightenment. It was his position that nation states should not have *absolute* sovereignty. His 'dream of a cosmopolitan point of view leading to perpetual peace' was firmly rooted in the universalist notion of the 'worldwide community of human beings' that the Greek meaning of the word 'cosmopolitan' implies, and stands in contrast to nationalism (Robbins 1998a: 2).[46] Kant's legacy, liberal moral

[46] Kant originally spoke of the cosmopolitan rights of the stranger in a foreign land, and of world peace through a federation of states. The cosmopolitan right was limited, specifically involving the treatment of strangers in a foreign land: do not treat them with hostility and do not turn them away if doing so could result in death ([1795] 1977a: 105-106). This right centred on hospitality and its limits.

cosmopolitanism, is in some ways the most anti-nationalist because human rights overrule state sovereignty.

The primary tenet in moral cosmopolitanism holds that all humans have equal moral worth. Logically, this means that any differentiation beyond the individual as a 'unit of moral concern' would not change whatever obligations people have towards each other (Pogge 2002: 169). A reasonable question might then be, what is the causal relationship between equal moral worth and moral obligations between those equals? Miller thinks it is a *non sequitur*, and that there is no logical reason to believe the latter automatically follows from the former (Miller in Beardsworth 2011: 26).

But Kantians contend that justice (as in moral obligations) can only emerge through the reason that brings us to the conclusion of equal moral worth.

> Moral philosophers who remain loyal to Kant are likely to think that a *lot* would be lost. Kant- ians typically insist that justice springs from reason and loyalty from sentiment. Only reason they say can impose universal and unconditional moral obligations, and our obligation to be just is unconditional. It is on another level from the sort of affectional relations which create loyalty. (Rorty 1997: 140)

As a Kantian theorist, Pauline Kleingeld maintains that as rational beings, all people are citizens of a single moral community 'because they are conceived of as free and equal co-legislators of moral law and, as such, are analogous to citizens of a political state' (2000: 314). Their moral obligations to each other, as part of that community, transcend 'nationality, language, religion, customs, and so on'. Thus, it would seem that to the moral cosmopolitan theorist, any form of nationalist obligation would be secondary to obligations to others as a whole. If loyalty to a group or nation is based in sentiment, then justice cannot result from it, meaning that attachments, affinities and loyalties do not appear to have a place in the context of justice and obligations within the nation or outside it.

For example, with a nationalist ethos, one country might claim the rights to all waters within its territories without regard to the water rights of others downstream if it determines that all waters are necessary for its survival, or even simply to maintain its standard of living. In such a scenario, any relinquishing of those rights would not be out of moral obligation (because compatriots come first), but out of sentiment, a favour to a neighbouring country, unless it is part of the quid pro quo of diplomatic relations. If the first country gets nothing out of allowing the neighbouring country access to water, they have no moral obligation to do so. This is contrary to

a cosmopolitan ethos, which considers justice on a global level. The nationalist determination seems almost arbitrary in its priorities, because determining the right of the neighbouring country to water is not beholden to global justice. The determination, in a Kantian analysis, would follow from loyalty to one's country first, not from justice. A cosmopolitan position would involve some kind of arbitration involving both countries to determine how justice (as fairness) would be served for both, as a duty. The moral cosmopolitan position on such obligations would appear to be unaffected by nations, identities, or geography.

Kleingeld thinks there is room for patriotism within cosmopolitan justice, and not simply to try to account for personal affinities and attachments. She claims that patriotism may even be a cosmopolitan duty. One might consider it a cosmopolitan duty to support one's state if it administers justice impartially, and to all (2000: 315). Because the concept of patriotism is becoming increasingly popular amongst some cosmopolitan theorists, her discourse on constructive patriotisms is a reasonably good breakdown on what nationalisms consists of, and so I outline it in some detail here. Kleingeld describes three forms, none of which is dependent on the degree of nationalist sentiment. *Civic patriotism* is a tradition of republicanism, which is the 'love of their shared political freedom and the institutions that sustain it'. It is political in nature and 'not dependent on national or ethnic identity' (2000: 317). *Nationalist patriotism* is not focused on the political, but instead on membership in the national group. The binding nationalism in this category is what people share: language, culture, ancestry, history, and so forth, and as such is not open to others who do not share the defining commonalities (Kleingeld 2000: 319). The nation state has historically been associated with this form of patriotism; however, borders are not definitive here. As noted above, some states encompass several nations, whilst some nations are spread over several states. Nationalist patriotism can exist in any form of nation, and is often the motivation for national self-determination. It has been framed as analogous to membership in a family. *Trait-based* patriotism is based on 'the love of one's country that results from reflection on or direct appreciation of its qualities' (2000: 320-321). These qualities can include love of the land in the form of the country. For example, 'French citizens who love France for its language and culture are "trait-based patriots"; Britons who love France for the very same reasons, namely for its language and culture, are "Francophile"' (2000: 319-321).

In short, Kleingeld determines that from a Kantian perspective, civic patriotism can be considered a cosmopolitan duty, whilst nationalist and trait-based nationalism are 'permissible'

unless rights are being violated. She adds that 'tepid patriotism is trivially compatible with cosmopolitanism, and fanatical patriotism' clearly not at all (2000: 322). Her argument that civic patriotism can be considered a cosmopolitan duty 'is premised on the human right to freedom and the conditions for its protection', which is that justice requires 'a state that has just laws and the power to enforce them' (2000: 324). She sees the capacity to reject or resist dangerous forms of nationalism in all three, but admits that 'each of these three forms can degenerate into a fanatical variety' (2000: 322). She appears to believe there is enough room for the positive aspects of these patriotisms that the extremist nationalisms we see today are much less likely to occur, and that resistance to them can be cultivated.

I argue that all of three of these patriotisms are similarly likely to descend into destructive nationalisms. All three she describes are in existence today, and all three have exhibited strains of nationalism's harmful exclusions. For example, in her claim that civic nationalism is not *dependent* on national identity (as it is more state and institution based), she does not explain how to ensure that national identity, and its problems, will not result from it. One could argue that the US was founded on civic patriotism, and yet it is one of the most nationalist countries in the world. Civic patriotism may theoretically support pluralism, but the object is still the nation state, and as such loyalty to it necessarily entails exclusions, given that national identity is based on exclusions. This inclines its members towards a more dangerous nationalism because these exclusions are hierarchical and serve to identify the norm, thereby further marginalising those excluded. Similarly, she describes nationalist patriotism as having no implication 'that one's own nation is *better* than others' simply because the focus is on the nation being one's own, 'instead of as the instantiation of a general idea or as the bearer of particular qualities' (2000: 320). Against Kleingeld's assumptions, I argue that any kind of nationalism inspires people to see their nation as better than others simply because it is theirs, despite the absence of an intrinsic reason to do so, and it is not clear how that tendency can be resisted.

It appears that the basic problem Kleingeld does not solve is the propensity to form strong national identities out of such patriotisms, and it remains even in her patriotisms that national identity and nationalism are based on exclusive, oppressive hierarchies. Ultimately these are human rights issues, which cosmopolitanism sees as universal. These hierarchies are inevitable within the existence of the nation state, for even the most benevolent state will use national identity to control its population and maintain its power. As such, cosmopolitanism would still be contrary to her patriotisms. Any ideology, identity, or sentiment that attempts to exclude

some people from the auspices of global justice is contrary to it. This claim has major implications for cosmopolitanism and state sovereignty. As Beitz notes:

> The force of moral cosmopolitanism is clearest when we consider what it rules out: cosmopolitanism stands opposed to any view that limits the scope of justification to the members of particular types of groups, whether identified by shared political values, communal histories, or ethnic characteristics. It also stands opposed to any view that allows the justification of choices to terminate in considerations about the non-derivative interests of collective entities such as states or social groups… If one takes the morality of states to posit that state boundaries are limits to the scope of justification, then cosmopolitanism is plainly incompatible with it. (Beitz 2005: 17)

It follows that if and when the interests of a sovereign state interfere with global justice, cosmopolitan justice represents a challenge to that sovereignty. Sovereignty is a highly contentious issue in political and philosophical debates (Neal 2004) and, for cosmopolitanism, the problem centres on justice in the area of human rights. Cosmopolitan univeralism claims those rights override state sovereignty. Despite Kleingeld's efforts it is difficult to imagine any form of patriotism or nationalism that does not call up national identity, which is based on hierarchical exclusions; those exclusions are often human rights issues (such marginalisations frequently include being denied the right to vote, unlawful incarceration, systematic discriminations, and being denied due process under the law). Cosmopolitanism as such should be concerned with these links here, and the normative theory needs to interrogate how national identity leads to such internal marginalisations in order to include them in their concerns for global human rights. If these links were made and nationalism/national identity fully deconstructed, I am convinced most, if not all cosmopolitan theorists would maintain an anti-nationalist/patriotic position.

As a normative cosmopolitan theorist, Pogge takes a generally anti-nationalist stance. He distinguishes 'particularistic' from 'universalistic variants of nationalism' (2002: 119). The former values nationalism only when it applies to one specific nation and not to the concept of nationalism itself. The latter 'assert[s] that all nations can be valuable communities'. He dismisses the former because of its 'chauvinist, often racist' tendencies as not worthy of 'serious moral discussion', focusing instead on the universalistic variants. Pogge then splits those variants into two types:

> *Common nationalism* Citizens and governments may, and perhaps should, show more concern for the survival and flourishing of their own states, cultures, and compatriots than for the survival and flourishing of foreign states, cultures, and persons.

> *Lofty nationalism* Citizens and governments may, and perhaps should, show more concern for the justice of their own state and for injustice (and other wrongs) suffered by its members than for the justice of any other social systems and for injustice (and other wrongs) suffered by foreigners (ibid.).

Pogge divides universalistic nationalism into those that are state and culture oriented, and those that are justice oriented. He ultimately finds that however acceptable 'lofty nationalism' might be, it is 'clearly limited in scope', as is 'common nationalism' (2002: 130-132). His moral cosmopolitanism does allow for certain, specific prioritising of compatriots and those 'near and dear':

> It is morally more important to stop injustices and other wrongs committed against our compatriots than to stop such injustices and wrongs committed against foreigners by third parties; and, more generally, it morally more important to attend to the needs of our compatriots than to give like assistance to foreigners. (Pogge 2002: 133)

He agrees with Nussbaum, who claims that prioritising attachments such as family enhance cosmopolitanism, but disagrees with Beitz by prioritising compatriots with 'like assistance' (Nussbaum 1996: 9, 135-136). However, when harm to foreigners is of 'our own doing', our obligations are on a par; and we have a greater obligation to such foreigners than we do to stopping injustices done to our own compatriots by third parties (2002: 133). In that sense, 'lofty nationalism' is limited. It is a matter of responsibility for our actions, and it also hints at the complexities of stopping injustices done to a third party by a fourth party. My inclination is that Pogge advocates resisting international conflict intervention until absolutely necessary, but his position is not entirely clear.

But are those obligations a result of nationalism or patriotism? Pogge reasons that they are not based on loyalty, but grounded in the principles of justice as being global in scope, with certain constraints (involving negative and positive duties) that most, if not all, nationalisms would reject. The economic and social knock-on effects of nationalism give us a better idea of where moral, normative cosmopolitan theorists such as Pogge take issue with it. As Miller explains: 'Explanatory nationalism is the view that the relative wealth and poverty of different societies can be fully explained by institutions and policies that are internal to each', a view that directly conflicts with Pogge's notions of distributive justice (Miller 2007: 244). Pogge claims that it absolves international influences and interests by placing all responsibility and solutions for oppressions on the country itself (2002: 141).

Miller argues that Pogge is critical of explanatory nationalism because 'the global order determines the effects of different national factors—were they different, the international effect on poverty, for example, would be different' (ibid.). Pogge does maintain that 'global factors are all-important for explaining present human misery' (2002: 144). He believes strongly in national responsibility on the global stage because of the degree of interconnectedness of the world's wealth, resources, environmental usages and standards of living. But Pogge also sees a graver danger posed by explanatory nationalism:

> Since we see no causal link between global factors and the incidence of oppression, corruption, and poverty, we do not even ask whether those who shape global institutions and, more generally, the global context in which the poorer countries are placed have a negative moral responsibility for world poverty. (Pogge 2002: 141)

To him, explanatory nationalism eliminates the very question of (even) negative moral responsibility of those players on the global economic stage. There is a certain irony here. Whilst rejecting explanatory nationalism does not require subscribing to cosmopolitanism, it is a position virtually every cosmopolitan theorist holds. It is in some ways surprising that Pogge has explored explanatory nationalism, understands the effects of nationalism on the interconnectedness between countries' standards of living, but does not examine more closely the foundations for nationalism within the nation. Perhaps this is because he naturalises connection to others closest to one's life, rather than exploring the ways in which hierarchies of gender and sexuality also structure how close ties are imagined and disrupted, but his reasons are unclear.

Pogge decries explanatory nationalism's denial of global responsibility, yet he fails to turn the gaze inward. He seems to take for granted what the obligations to compatriots might be, focusing instead on whether or not we have the same obligations to those outside a nation's borders. He does make clear that it is the workings of nationalism that cause some countries to shirk any responsibility they may have towards another in order to privilege their own people and their own state, and at the cost of that other. But he does not make the link that the nationalisms that privileges some compatriots over others are the same that exclude those from other countries from their principles of justice. The marginalising hierarchies nationalism engages in internally are complicit with the othering of those across borders. Whilst nationalism is not the cause of all global problems, his default position remains focused on the relationship between nation states, and not specifically what role nationalism plays in internal oppressions. The national identity that feeds off the marginalised within is complicit with that which others

the foreigner. Both serve to prop up the powers of the state, and benefit those who are on the dominant sides of its hegemonies. To dismiss either focus obfuscates the overall influence of nationalism, both inter-and intra-nationally.

These normative theorists assume the nation state as it stands today may change and evolve, but see it as unlikely to change fundamentally in the near future. However, Nussbaum and others have also considered one's nationality as arbitrary, and thus 'morally irrelevant' (Nussbaum1996: 5). By extension, as with Beitz, if one's nationality is irrelevant to questions of morality, it is irrelevant to the terms of global justice as well (Scheffler 2008: 69). Therefore, moral obligations should not factor in nationality or identity. But the question of community and family affinities and attachments remains. It is safe to assume that the wellbeing of kin generally overrides that of strangers, and this would seem contradictory to the notion that cosmopolitan justice should be blind to attachment and identities. How does one reconcile the equal moral worth of all people and the resulting moral obligation to treat others equally, with the near-universal phenomenon to take care of one's own first, whether that is one's family, or one's compatriots? Scheffler agrees with Nussbaum's reasoning that by taking care of one's own, we are better prepared to take care of others; in effect, there is no 'Nussbaum's dilemma', because the 'natural' tendency to prioritise those most intimate with us works well to organise life at the family and perhaps communal level (Scheffler 2001b: 118-123).

Miller disagrees and argues that cosmopolitan theorists need to make a choice. They cannot claim moral obligations are the same for all, and yet choose family over strangers, or compatriots over foreigners, when stopping injustices.

> The choice, as I see it, is either to adopt a more heroic version of universalism, which attaches no intrinsic significance to national boundaries, or else to embrace ethical particularism and see whether one can defend oneself against the charge that one is succumbing to irrational sentiment in giving weight to national allegiances. (Miller 1995: 64-65)

Whilst I disagree that there are no other choices outside of Miller's heroic universalism and ethical particularism, Scheffler, Nussbaum, and Pogge to some degree in effect place intimate affinities in a different category of attachments than the more distant loyalty to the nation. This raises the question: how might we tell when a 'tendency' that helps us organise life at the family, and possibly communal, levels translates to an identification that involves excluding others from justice? Are all attachments inherently dangerous? Or is it safe to allow exceptions for intimate relationships? These debates typically avoid problems with how attachments proceed, for

example, within families, yet continue to be valued over others attachments. This is especially true when one family member is distinctly different from others, as is often the case with LGBT people, who frequently form their own 'families' out of community and people who were previously 'strangers'. I suggest the nature of the problem is less about attachments and affinities and more about identification and identity, and despite the dangers of exclusion identities so often pose, it is necessarily allowable in a democratic society, particularly one that prioritises open political engagement (Butler 1995b: 129). However, whilst I would not deny the 'tendency' towards prioritising family needs over the needs of distant strangers, when group attachments form identities that marginalise those outside of such an identity, there is a turn towards othering that may be inevitable.

Families are an example of othering that can occur even within subgroups. In the US (and virtually all other countries where there is any kind of queer movement), LGBT identity has been a politically necessary and expedient process in the quest for equal rights and social acceptance. Yet in many of these communities if an individual expresses a certain LGB identity and then engages in sexual behaviour contrary to that identity, or expresses a change in identity, they may very well experience disapproval and ostracisation from their community. This can be particularly painful if they've also been ostracised from their genetic family for their initial alternative behaviour or identity that may have brought dishonour and misery to them. Despite the seemingly unbreakable bonds of family, they are attachments that can be positive or negative, and there is the risk of othering within them, as with any subgroup. It is the double-edged sword of identity politics: such attachments and identities can save people's lives, provide community, and motivate movements; they can simultaneously exclude those who do not comply with behaviour deemed appropriate for such identities. Identity always involves defining what one *isn't*, and if that definition is transgressed, it potentially threatens that identity for others as well.

Whilst the debate regarding the compatibility of nationalism and cosmopolitanism continues, some cosmopolitan theorists have focused their critiques on disciplinary trends that take the nation state as a given. Beck urges sociologists to move beyond the nation state as a given, while Robert Fine extends this with respect to international relations (2003), arguing that:

> Cosmopolitan political philosophy affirms the possibility and desirability of overriding national sovereignty in the name of cosmopolitan justice. It appeals to the *historical contingency* of the nation state as the organizing principle of political communities, to the

> death of nationalism as a normative principle of social integration, and to the *rationality* of cosmopolitanism as the fulfilment of the Enlightenment project. (Fine 2003: 453-454)

What I find particularly interesting in Fine's precise version of the cosmopolitan position on sovereignty and the nation state is that it is preceded by his assertion that cosmopolitan law 'reaches both inside and outside states', and is followed by the cosmopolitan rejection of the 'temporal matrix which declares that *inside* the state progress can be accomplished over time but that *outside* there can only be an eternal repetition of power and interest' (2003: 452-453). He assumes the rejection of absolute sovereignty, insists that cosmopolitanism is a force both inside and outside the state, and understands social progress to be possible in both realms. But his insightful observations do not appear to have led the liberal, normative branch of cosmopolitanism to examine *what* that relationship is between sovereignty, nationalism and the oppression of minorities within the nation state is, or to conceptualise it as one of dependence.

Beck marks out two distinct cosmopolitanisms that begin to address the tensions over nationalism and the nation state: 1) the normative, philosophical (liberal) approach that prioritises international and cultural harmony, and 2) the 'descriptive-analytic approach' more common in the social sciences, which 'frees itself from nationalist categories in its thinking and research' (2004: 132). The significance of the second approach is that it involves what he terms 'methodological cosmopolitanism' in response to an outdated 'methodological nationalism'. Beck defines methodological nationalism as the perspective of a social scientist who sees that '"modern society" and "modern politics" can be organized only in the form of national states' where '[s]ociety is equated with national-territorial society organized in states' (2004: 139). That perspective assumes the nation state as a starting point. It has not, however, always existed, nor is it inevitable.

Yet Pogge and Beitz, as normative, anti-nationalist, cosmopolitan theorists are suspicious of the nation state and do not engage in methodological nationalism. Instead, they work within the limitations of that system absent a viable alternative (Pogge's Global Resource Dividend being one example)—but they do not accept that the nation state system can accommodate cosmopolitanism. Beck may be referring to Pogge's qualifications for prioritising the needs of compatriots over foreigners in some situations, but other normative theorists such as Beitz do not accept the nation state as either inevitable or desirable.

However, these analyses also illustrate the various ways in which normative cosmopolitan theory problematises nationalism, whilst different cosmopolitan theorists consider varying levels

of tolerance for attachments. In the context of cosmopolitanism, there appear to be two general forms of attachment: 1) to a geographical place that may or may not generate different or multiple other attachments, and 2) to a community, which could be based on any number of factors: place, religion, ethnicity, political ideals, etc. Familial attachments would belong to the latter. A related question might be whether all attachments produce similar exclusions to those associated with nationalism. Indeed, it can be difficult to choose a 'cosmopolitan identification with the human race… as the thin, abstract, undesirable antithesis to a red-blooded, politically engaged nationalism' (Robbins 1998a: 4).

This question has traditionally divided normative, moral cosmopolitan theorists (such as Nussbaum, Beitz, and Pogge) and critical theorists (such as Appiah, Robbins, Bhabha and Pollock). Appiah has no trouble reconciling his cosmopolitanism with some degree of civic and ethnic patriotism, as evidenced in 'Cosmopolitan Patriots' (Appiah 1998). He has suggested that all people can claim rootedness, which is his description for the attachments one feels for home and culture. He goes on to surmise that it may be a necessary foundation for taking pleasure in the difference of others and places not of one's own (1998: 91-92). And when people move, cosmopolitan patriots accept 'the citizens' responsibility to nurture the culture and the politics of their homes', creating cultural hybridisation.

Nussbaum and Appiah have had some disagreement on the 'moral irrelevance' of nationality in the past (Appiah 1998: 95-96). But Nussbaum has taken a recent turn towards a position on patriotism that looks a bit closer to Appiah's. Whilst Appiah, Pollock and Bhabha and others have theorised the self-evident importance of attachments and community the world over (Appiah 1998; Pollock and Bhabha 2000), Nussbaum's shift in 'Toward a Globally Sensitive Patriotism' (2008) is couched more in terms of her moral philosophy. Stating that she has become a Rawlsian political liberal, Nussbaum rejects 'cosmopolitanism as a comprehensive doctrine' (though most theorists actively resist calling it a doctrine at all) and has reversed her stance on the loneliness of the cosmopolitan choice (2008: 79-80). She now believes that 'the denial of particular attachments leaves life empty of meaning for most of us', agreeing with the more common sentiment. However, she claims that 'national sentiment is… a way of making the mind bigger, calling it away from its immersion in greed and egoism toward a set of values connected to a decent common life and the need for sacrifices connected to that common life' (and a high degree of sacrifice at that) (2008: 80, 83). Her philosophical development is thus increasingly compatible with Appiah's, where he states that core values do not necessarily have

to be the same for all in a particular community, but the commitment to those social institutions responsible for 'the conditions necessary for life' must be agreed upon as the political culture of the state (Appiah 1998: 102, 107).

Up to this point, changes in Nussbaum's position do not necessarily counter a broader cosmopolitan position. But she now considers the nation state and national sentiment to be a necessary platform on which to shift people out of what she sees is a tendency toward greed and self-absorption. To Nussbaum, nation states are not stable without nationally shared moral sentiments, and the nation state must include *'a strong form of national sovereignty'* (emphasis added) for the benefit of all human beings (2008: 80-81). She agrees with Kant that the nation state is imperative for accountability in political representation and that supranational organisations do not (yet) have that capacity. But her solution to the problem of extreme nationalisms is to suggest a 'purified' patriotism that is firmly linked to deeper moral principles which reject such nationalisms and which would 'breed contempt for aggression against other nations and, equally, for internal hatreds and group animosities' (Nussbaum 2008: 83-84).

Like Fine, Nussbaum acknowledges the internal as well as external forces and dangers of nationalism, but goes further in problematising nationalist exclusions.[47] Rather uniquely, and very importantly for this project, she includes the oppression of women and homosexuals as part of these 'internal hatreds', insists that masculinity and the idea of the 'real' man must be addressed, and links these 'hatreds' and misogynist masculinities to the more 'contemptuous' nationalism (2008: 85; see also 2004). Of the more normative theorists, Nussbaum alone prioritises these links and repeats these concerns in her advocacy of a purified patriotism. She thus insists that:

> we must not base patriotic sentiment on any ethnolinguistic homogeneity, or on any religious sentiments that are divisive. It must appeal to sentiments that bind together the citizens of modern democracies that are diverse in religion and ethnicity, all of whom must be treated as fully equal citizens. (ibid.)

She maps the complicity of nationalism with these internal marginalisations, including linking them to colonialism and to the more general, and powerful, meanings of nation, and

[47] Nussbaum is one of the few cosmopolitan theorists who have observed and written about how nationalism othering those within the nation state. She draws from examples that are seemingly bounded within the US, such as baseball games between two American teams, and the tendency of Little League (baseball) parents who encourage their children not only to win against other children, but also to dominate and even humiliate them in the process. It illuminates how insidious national identities in particular work to marginalise minorities within the state (Kalogeras 2011).

acknowledges the 'identification of the female body with the nation'. She understands the link between national identity and those marginalisations; and, that it is the objectification of women that allows them to be denied autonomy and be seen as 'violable'. This objectification is instrumental in women's subjugation and is 'a means to an end' to cement power for those who benefit (Nussbaum 2004: Part III; see also Nagel 1998: 261). Her object of study in 2004 was the 2002 massacre of over 2,000 Muslims in Gujarat, India, which involved the rape, mutilation and killing of hundreds of women, and which she interrogated so carefully in 'Body of Nation'. I would expect her to reject any kind of nationalism because of its dangers she meticulously revealed in that article, but instead she has determined that if compassion and other necessary moral sentiments are cultivated through nationalist norms, then the better patriotism will prevail:

> Because compassion is not intrinsically reliable–for example, people usually feel compassion more strongly toward the near and dear than toward the distant– it must therefore be carefully constructed in connection with the nation's moral norms. (Nussbaum 2008: 84)

Nussbaum adopts this notion of 'purified patriotism' from the 18th century philosopher Johan Gottfried Herder. Herder may or may not have been familiar with the genocidal associations that occur when those two words form one term, but I have to assume Nussbaum is aware of the association. It appears to me that her idealisation of patriotism is unrealistic. To my knowledge, there has been no nationalism in history that has not been based in identity formation-by-exclusion, usually with negative results and always with that potential. Furthermore, her claim that some form of national sentiment is necessary to 'jolt' people out of their self-indulgent complacency does not bear up in light of the facts.

Miller seems to agree with Nussbaum that nationalism is significantly more extreme than patriotism, positing that 'culture plays a much larger part in defining national identity' for the latter (Miller 2006: 532). For Miller, culture means religion, language, art, music, cuisine, etc. But he also states that the other major difference between the two is political:

> Nations are the units within which democratic institutions should operate, and since each member of the nation has something to contribute to its cultural development, political democracy becomes the natural vehicle for national self-determination. Patriotism has no such specific political entailments. (ibid.)

Miller does not consider the politics of culture when making such distinctions, as if religion or art or language are apolitical and have no bearing on political institutions. One example of the politicisation of patriotism is the USA PATRIOT Act, which is shorthand for 'Uniting and

Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act', signed into law in 2001, shortly after the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City.[48] It reduces restrictions on law enforcement in order to combat terrorism, and it includes the possible suspension of such basic rights as habeas corpus, thus allowing for indefinite detention. It was a nationalist reaction to an attack on American soil (and has since been renewed several times by Congress) with enormous implications for American citizens at home. The use of 'patriotism' in the name is not cultural, but political and legal. Patriotism is the favoured term over nationalism in the US, most likely because of nationalism's association with fascism in the 20th century. It is also a way of using the concept of nationalism itself to divide nations between the 'good' nationalisms of post-9/11 America (where patriotism is the preferred term) and 'bad' nationalisms of less developed nations (Puri 2004: 2, 12).

Neither Miller nor Nussbaum appear to be overly concerned about the insistent use of patriotism as an acceptable stand-in for nationalism, particularly in the US. Both seem to have highly individual and idealistic notions of the distinction; however, they may not see those distinctions as exceptional. But in within this project's framework, how these terms are taken up currently and historically cannot be separated from a critical cosmopolitan theory that unpacks their deeper meanings and implications, and how those meanings are ultimately drawn together through national identity.

Even Appiah, who advocates a patriotism more simply associated with community and rootedness, recognises the perils. In addition to the more common dangers already mentioned, he argues against what he calls 'cultural patrimony', the nationalist (civic or ethnic) sense of ownership over what a group has inherited by virtue of place, often regardless of time or nationality, and codified by organisations such as UNESCO (Appiah 2006: 118-119). He gives the example of the Nok sculptures of Nigeria, which are two thousand years older than the nation, which is under a century old. The link is not Nigerian or religious or cultural, but geographic:

> We don't know whether Nok sculptures were commissioned by kings or commoners; we don't know whether the people who made them and the people who paid for them thought of them as belonging to the kingdom, to a man, to a lineage, to the gods. One thing we know for sure, however, is that they didn't make them for Nigeria. (ibid.)

[48]See http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-107hr3162enr/pdf/BILLS-107hr3162enr.pdf .

Particularly dangerous are nationalisms that affirm cultural identity by equating it with economic and/or military superiority, as seems to be the case in the US (Robbins 1998a: 13-14). The nationalisms that have been proven most dangerous are those that appear to be pathological at their core, those 'linked to the right-wing racist ideologies of the Axis powers of the Second World War, the rise of new right-wing movements and xenophobia in Western Europe, and genocidal wars in Eastern Europe' (Cheah 1998a: 20). Rootedness, as recognising where one came from and perhaps still having ties and loyalties to that place, can be positive and supportive of groups and individuals, and few cosmopolitan theorists deny its existence. But it is sometimes linked to national identity and thus exclusion, and as such risks of developing into nationalism.

Nationalism and difference

> And often, when America is in a period of economic anxiety, it starts looking around for individuals to blame. And sometimes, the very best place to start asserting control is right in the middle of a woman, in her uterus. (Harris-Lacewell 2010)

Identity formation

In Chapter Three, I investigated the concept of relational autonomy and its potential for recuperating the more individualistic autonomy that liberalism leans towards. There, I discussed relationality and intersubjectivity as more constructive answers to liberal autonomy's constraints. I return to relationality here in order to illuminate how identity, including national identity, is formed in relation to others, as part of further elucidating the problematic reliance of nationalism on national identity. I extend my argument here that the exclusions and hierarchical marginalisations that structure broader meanings of nation depend on national identity formation, and make the case for the importance of any renewed cosmopolitanism to deconstruct national identity's function and oppressive tendencies.

Nedelsky, for one, points out that 'people do not live in isolation, but in social and political relations', and that they develop their identities, predispositions 'in large part out of these relations' (1989: 21). That is a common enough notion: we define ourselves through how we identify with others. The process involves othering as well: we are also like *these people* because we are not like those *others*. This is not in addition to the process of identification, but necessary to it. Butler explains how intrinsic disidentification is to identification, as follows:

> identification always relies upon a difference that it seeks to overcome, and … its aim is accomplished only by reintroducing the difference it claims to have vanquished. The one with whom I identify is not me, and that "not being me" is the condition of the

> identification. Otherwise, as Jacqueline Rose reminds us, identification collapses into identity, which spells the death of identification itself. This difference internal to identification is crucial, and, in a way, it shows us that disidentification is part of the common practice of identification itself. (Butler 2004: 145-146).

Many theorists, particularly in postcolonial theory, have noted the prevalence of such disidentifications in colonised societies. Ronald Takaki gives a meticulous description of the demonisation of Native Americans by Puritan settlers in the 17th century involving such disidentification. He uses Kai Erikson's work to describe the process by which they kept their cultural (and in that sense, national) identity intact despite being completely isolated from the norms, institutions, and conventions of their English homeland (Takaki 1993: 41).[49]

The process of national identity formation is continuous, and the objects of disidentification change over time. Puri notes that 'nationalisms need to be continually imagined, reproduced, and reiterated in order for them to appear normal and natural' (2004: 210; see also Hall 2002: 82). They have no intrinsic value outside of their unique ideologies, leading Benedict Anderson to suggest that the concept would be more comprehensible 'if one treated it as if it belonged with "kinship" and "religion", rather than with "liberalism" or "fascism"' (Anderson, B. 2006: 5). Puri concurs, stating that 'national identities do not have any inherent essence, but are defined in relation to each other' (2004: 15). She describes how national identity can sometimes be 'defined in opposition to another', using the case of American nationalism erupting after the attack on the US on 9/11. This burst of nationalism was not heavily characterised by 'any innate or fixed notion of American identity', but 'in diametrical opposition to that of Afghanistan' (which harboured the attackers). Identity, in this way, is a disavowal of the other, a discursive practice that can 'accommodate alliances' and 'entertain contradictions' that per se may be neither positive nor negative (Khayatt 2002: 496). Despite this fluid character of identity, its problems begin with its *reduction* to difference, producing binaries that result in persistently unequal power relations:

> [W]hen identity is reduced to difference it stabilizes the term, it freezes it for contrast, and it renders its boundaries rigid. On the other hand, when identity is deployed for political struggle, it negotiates as it separates, it gathers as it organizes. (ibid.)

---

[49] In New England, colour figures prominently in many passages depicting 'savagery'—it was specifically racialised, and Indians were portrayed as a demonic race. The fervently religious Puritans feared they were at risk of losing their moral cleanliness being so far from the safe conventions (surveillance methods and regulatory regimes) of the more civilized society from which they came (Takaki 1993: 44). Their religion was also tied more directly into their belief that as a people—in that sense, as a nation—they were destined to take over the land from the present occupiers.

Its very subjugating properties allows for its agency, which in turn produces boundaries that are changeable and 'elastic', as Didi Khayatt noted above.[50] This is the contradiction within identity: it is perceived, even desired to be fixed, whilst evolving according to the needs it serves.

Consider, in this context, the formation of 'gay' identity in the US. There was no gay identity in the US before social and legal restrictions forced homosexuals to closet themselves, and to seek out each other in private (Faderman 1991; Katz 1976). Discrimination, persecution, and oppression led to resistance and political activism. For much of the last half of the 20th century, identifying as gay in the US often meant not being heterosexual, which left bisexuals invisible (revealing at least one contradiction within the binary). What was important to the wider society, and then for those without certain rights because of sexual orientation, was what they were not: heterosexual. There is no inherent link between gay men and lesbians, except for the fact of being marginalised for sexual attraction to one's own gender—not being heterosexual. But politically and culturally, identifying similarly (if sometimes contentiously) has been advantageous for the LGBT rights movement. It was this exclusion and oppression that resulted in homosexual identification. Political power came from the developing gay identity-formed-in-opposition. And whilst many gays and lesbians continue to argue that homosexuality is innate and biological despite a lack of hard evidence, it has been politically expedient to do so.[51] This tactic, however, places an enormous burden on homosexuality. If it is framed as genetic, does that make choice somehow false, negative or otherwise unacceptable? Does it disallow for changes in one's sexual orientation? How much of 'gay culture' is biological? The drive towards a gay identity resulted in essentialising sexual orientation, confirming the hetero- homosexual binary and constraining heterosexuality as well by denying its discursive constructions. It further separates and cements categories of people, which historically have not served marginalised groups well. So whilst the process of identification can be constructive and productive, it still involves exclusion, produces essentialism, and reifies difference.

Body of nation

Women, homosexuals and non-white people play major parts in the creation of national symbols, values, norms and mythologies—all are taken up in particular ways to form the

[51] This is not to say that homosexuality is not genetic. There is no hard evidence either way (though speculation continues in both directions), but it has been a political strategy as well as a strong belief for many LGB people since the inception of the western gay rights movement.

national identity. The links between these axes of difference are separate but bound up with one another. Whilst debates regarding sex often appear to be only about sexuality, sexuality itself serves 'as a trope for other power relations' and has been an 'abiding aspect of imperial power' (thus key to colonising nationalisms in particular) (McClintock 1995: 14, 61). Sexuality is, as Foucault says, 'an especially dense transfer point for relations of power', a highly efficient and flexible instrument for social control, and always understood in the context of power relations (Foucault 1980: 103). Nationalism is fundamentally about solidifying and controlling a population base that works to secure power within a state, and sexuality is instrumental in regulating bodies and populations through conceptions of race and gender norms (thereby identifying those who deviate from them) (Mosse 1985: 10; Puri 2004: 107-108, 166).[52]

It is bodies that need to be controlled, and it is bodies upon which nation is written, as Nussbaum points out (2004). Whilst overt symbols of nationalism, such as the national flag, anthem and monuments have served the national consciousness since the early 19th century, more covertly were these often-corporeal, essentialised stereotypes of men and women (Mosse 1985: 16). 'The visual self-representation of the nation was just as important as the much cited literature of nationalism' (ibid.). William Bloom stresses the importance of these 'experienced realities':

> Political ideologies do not work in a psychological vacuum. They must provide appropriate modes of behaviour, appropriate attitudes, appropriate ideologies, appropriate identity-securing interpretive systems, for dealing with real, experienced situations. Popular support - i.e. identification with such an ideology - comes only if it interprets and provides an appropriate attitude for an experienced reality. This experience may, of course, be politically manipulated - but a symbol or an ideology without a relevant experience is meaningless and impotent in terms of evoking identification. (Bloom 1990: 52)

The visibility of gender and race is a key part of that representation. Women, in this sense, are highly symbolic of national ideologies and identity. Nira Yuval-Davis observes that 'constructions of nationhood usually involve specific notions of both "manhood" and "womanhood"', and it serves as example of how sexual identities work through disidentification as well (1997: 1). She describes five major ways nationalism is dependent on the status of women. They are biological producers, reproducers of boundaries of ethnic and national groups, cultural transmitters of ideological reproduction, signifiers of ethnic and national difference, and

[52] Sander Gilman's essay, 'Black Bodies, White Bodies' details these connections between nation, race, sex and gender (particularly through morality and disease) by revealing the slippage between bodies, especially of the prostitute as the essential sexualised woman, and specifically the 'Hottentot Venus' as the essential racialised woman (1992).

participants in national, economic and military struggles (Yuval-Davis 1997: 1-25). Men, too, have their roles, as soldiers, leaders and heroes, and their masculinity is reinforced by the roles of women as wives and daughters (Mosse 1985: 23; Nagel 1998: 256; Nussbaum 2004; Puri 2004: 128). As Yuval-Davis points out, national cultural reproduction is the responsibility of women.

> [V]ery often, gender is reduced to issues of women. But the 'mothers of nation' are often constructed as cultural reproducers, the ones who are supposed to teach particular songs, and cook particular dishes, to be responsible for the symbolic identity being reproduced from one generation to another. (Lee 2009: 132)

Women may uphold the moral values of the nation and take the role of 'cultural producers', but despite the positive projection of these roles and responsibilities, they are in reality oppressive to women (and to men for their roles). They are the result of social and national coercion in the name of national identity and of defining the 'nature' of the nation.

One of the most fascinating gendered public embodiments of nationalism and national identity is Puri's documentation and analysis of the case of the Miss America pageants. In the US, local pageants were common previous to World War II, but it was not until then that the national one commenced to 'a respectable and national spectacle' (Puri 2004: 107). It is a competition between women not only for who might be the 'most beautiful', but who most successfully epitomises what America is. The first African American did not win until 1983. Vanessa Williams was light-skinned, straight-haired and European looking (ibid.). Her win was reflective of the time. It had been 20 years since the US Supreme Court decision *Brown v. Board of Education* declared racial segregation illegal. The race riots of the 1960s and 1970s were effectively over. African Americans were 'mainstreaming', but only to the degree that was acceptable to the dominant white culture. The pageants produced and reproduced notions of how women should look and behave. They are

> a way to track significant social trends of womanhood, including ideals of beauty, femininity, and women's roles in American society… But saying that the Miss America beauty pageant is about ideal womanhood and national identity presents only a partial picture. What is not reflected in this account of the competition is that the competition promotes heterosexual, class- and race-based ideals of femininity in the national imagination. (Puri 2004: 107-108)

Questions of raced, gendered, and sexual identity tend to work in concert as part of national identity. For Puri, the Miss America pageants are a case in point, and her account of their history and contemporary valence highlights how certain expectations remain consistent throughout this

history of a nationalist event such as the Miss American pageants, and how other expectations change over time. Whilst the Miss America pageant endures change through the decades, it continues to portray and perpetuate women as 'vessels of cultural nationalism', showing how '"our" women are different from "their" women', both for the national consciousness, and for the international audience as the competitions graduate to the Miss Universe pageant (2004: 114-117). The judges of these pageants, from the local to the national, are arbiters of what and who represents what being an American should mean. They in turn represent the 'ideals or customs of dominant groups', which are 'endorsed as national ideals, and socially and legally, albeit unevenly, enforced' (2004: 153). Vanessa Williams was stripped of her title after nude photos of her with another woman were published in Penthouse. A certain propriety and morality are important to the pageants, despite the overt sexualisation of the contestants, and I speculate even more so with the first African American woman because of how tightly race and sex intersect. And yet today, with profitable singing and acting careers, she is considered to be the most success Miss America winner post-pageant in its history.

Most theories on nationalism claim one major aspect to be the sharing of past and future public experiences. Yet despite women being the primary symbol of nation, despite the enormity of women's involvement in the formation of nation and nationalism, it is less their future than their contributions would suggest, given that women's experiences and strategies for the future are so often unrelated to nationalist strategies they are encouraged to support (Enloe 1989: 46). McClintock argues that experience of nation is heavily gendered to the detriment of women, particularly in postcolonial states:

> [N]o postcolonial state anywhere has granted women and men equal access to the rights and resources of the nation state. Not only have the needs of postcolonial nations been largely identified with male conflicts, male aspirations and male interests, but the very representation of national power has rested on prior constructions of gender power. (McClintock 1995: 13-14)

Persecution is most often heightened during times when nationalist sentiments run high. Men's and women's roles are further entrenched, and ethnocentrism 'becomes animated' (Nagel 1998: 248; see also Associated Press 2004). The oppression of homosexuals tends to be more overt and sanctioned, and whilst the link to nation may not be as obvious as with women's status, it is deeply entrenched and central to defining, in effect, the sexuality of the nation. Although the US military never overtly allowed homosexuals to serve in the military openly before 2011, there was a wide range of discretion in its history. It was during and soon after World War II that the

state became actively involved in pursuing homosexuals in government positions and in the military.

> During this postwar period, the state used homosexual identity as a mechanism of repression. It was the government that sought to impose identity as a public classification onto private acts. The state's ascertainment and exposure of private conduct created a forced public status, often accompanied by a confession, or forced speech (Hunter 2006: 120-121).

Homosexuals were considered a national security threat for several decades following WWII, and although those particular persecutions waned over the years, heteronormativity continued to define the nationalist image, again especially during periods of high nationalist fervour. Jasbir Puar investigated the sexual component of the Abu Ghraib prison scandal in 2004 during the American occupation of Iraq. Wartime prisoners were tortured by the US military and photos taken by US soldiers of torture scenes were leaked to the press (Puar 2005). The American public reacted strongly to the photos, which were explicit and frequently sexual, sparking a national debate and prompting an investigation and eventual prison sentences for several of those (only) directly involved. Puar notes that though there were few, if any, public debates about sexuality and the so-called 'war on terror' after the 9/11 attacks, 'the "prisoner sexual abuse scandal," as it is now termed, vividly reveals that sexuality constitutes a central and crucial component of American patriotism' (2005: 34). The scandal was widely considered shameful and the acts un-American, and then-President George W. Bush used it to shore up what it meant to be American, noting – as Puar again reminds us – that '"Their treatment does not reflect the *nature* of the American people"' (14)...The acts included stripping the prisoners and forcing them to climb on top of each other into a pile and simulate sodomy. Despite both prisoners and US soldiers consisting of men and women, Puar further notes that all of the sexual acts simulated are 'all specifically and only gay sex acts' (although acts of rape against female prisoners were reported later) (2005: 33). Sexualised torture and humiliation were largely characterised as homosexual and it was this aspect less than the torture itself that deemed the acts to be particularly despicable and 'un-American'.

Race and gender are interrelated in the visual perception of nation, too. Butler reminds us that race, gender and class are 'vectors of power that require and deploy each other' (1993: 18). They are discrete but imbricating forces in the production and reproduction of sexuality and nation, particularly through regulating morality. As such, US national identity is produced and reproduced through an overt and visible dependence on heteronormativity. McClintock observes

that '… colonized peoples were figured as sexual deviants, whilst gender deviants were figured as racial deviants' (1995: 182). As key signifiers of nation, the slippage between race, sex and gender is utilised not only as a regulatory device, but as a way of defining what *looks* to be most symbolic or representative of nation by labelling the deviant.[53]

The oppressions and marginalisations I have been describing are hierarchically organised.[54] Gayle Rubin's 'charmed circle' illustrates how sexual deviance encompasses degrees of privilege and exclusion (Rubin 1993). It changes over time, whilst heteronormativity remains primary: in many parts of the US, a gay couple with children adopting heteronormative conventions is now considered more socially acceptable than a polyamorous, childless heterosexual couple who identify primarily through BDSM rather than gender-sex orientation. McClintock reminds us that 'the rationed privileges of race all too often put white women in positions of decided—if borrowed—power, not only over colonized women but also over colonized men' and were not simply passive bystanders of empire, but 'ambiguously complicit both as colonizers and colonized, privileged and restricted, acted upon and acting' (McClintock 1995: 6). Rights movements gain in fits and starts and are sometimes at odds. In the US, African American men achieved suffrage long before women, though it may well have happened the other way around. In fact, before the US's Voting Rights Act of 1965, African Americans had significantly greater obstacles when attempting to vote than women had after achieving suffrage, and with Congress neglecting to renew the Act in 2014, such obstacles based on race are reappearing. And whilst LGBT marriage rights in the US being gained on state and federal levels as of 2014, heterosexual (and other) women are increasingly being denied abortion and contraception rights. What these two opposing trends have in common is heteronormativity: non-heterosexuals conforming to (and actively taking part in) heteronormative conventions are acceptable, whilst women who do not conform to the 'bearers of nation' roles regardless of their

[53] Sander Gilman's essay, 'Black Bodies, White Bodies' details these connections between nation, race, sex and gender (particularly through morality and disease) by revealing the slippage between bodies, especially of the prostitute as the essential sexualised woman, and specifically the 'Hottentot Venus' as the essential racialised woman (1992).

[54] Mosse describes the importance of racism's categorisations to nationalism in England and Germany in the 19th and 20th centuries and the link to sexuality: 'Racism strengthened both historical and the visual thrust of nationalism; it emphasized the stereotypes of superior and inferior races, while the distinctive history of each people was said to determine their superiority or inferiority for all time to come. Racism was a heightened nationalism… it emphasized the distinction between vice and virtue, the necessity of a clear line between the normal and abnormal according to the rules society laid down… The association between racism and sexuality was immediate and direct. Racism brought to a climax tendencies that had been inherent in the alliance between nationalism and respectability' (Mosse 1985: 133).

other minority circumstances (for if one knows the right people and has enough money, lack of access to abortion and contraception can be overcome) are further marginalised, punished, and stripped of rights.

Defining heteronormativity through homophobia

> Nationalism and respectability assigned everyone his place in life, man and woman, normal and abnormal, native and foreigner, any confusion between these categories threatened chaos and loss of control. (Mosse 1985: 16)

What is perhaps most surprising about the lack of attention normative, anti-nationalist cosmopolitan theorists have paid to assessing the internal causes of nationalism is the complicity these internal marginalisations have with nationalisms projected across borders. It is not unusual for national representatives to make statements directed at other countries about who is not part of or does not belong to their country. US President George W. Bush was not the first to essentialise his country's 'nature' and state who was not part of his country because of that 'nature' (Puar 2005: 14). The increased international attention LGB rights (as human rights) has garnered towards the end of the 20th century has given rise to backlashes that have taken different forms, including the renewed yearning to essentialise and codify heterosexuality as part of the 'nature' of nation (see Richardson 1998: 92). The exclusions through which national identity is formed must be iterated, reiterated and reinforced regularly if that identity is to continue to be perceived, and experienced, as fixed. Perhaps there is no greater example of national identity's dependence on marginalisations and exclusions than the unceasing use of homophobia to stir nationalist sentiment, and to define forcefully who is allowed be part of the nation and who is not. In relation to LGB rights as human rights, for example, it is not uncommon to hear leaders and representatives of nations claim that there is no homosexuality in their country, or that it is an imposition or contamination by foreigners. [55] In 2007, Iran's President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad stated that Iran has no homosexuals 'like in your country. We don't have that in our country. In Iran, we do not have this phenomenon' (Khanna, S. 2007).

It is not only leaders and representatives that mobilise national sentiment through homophobia, of course. In May 2010, for example, Lithuania held its first successful Gay Pride celebration. Darja Davydova observed the event and pointed out that 'Eastern European prides are usually

[55] In fact, it was not until the 1990 Immigration Act that the United States removed homosexuality from their immigration exclusions list.
http://cis.org/Immigration%2526Homosexuals-PolicyTowardHomosexuals (cut and paste link into browser)

outnumbered by nationalist and religious counter-demonstrations and frequently result in violence' (Davydova 2012: 33). She notes that unlike Western European countries where nationalist extremists are unorganised and generally discredited, they are legitimised and represented on the national level in many Eastern European countries and actively use the link between homophobia and nationalism: 'These movements capitalise on popular homophobic sentiments and use anti-gay demonstrations as an arena for anti-European activism' (ibid.).

Despite being moderate, subdued, and nearly unchallenging to the nation's general heteronormativity, the participants were met with angry anti-gay protesters who proclaimed them to be immoral on religious and nationalist grounds. The protesters used the event to discredit what has been seen as the European Union's interference in Lithuania. Groups that protested included 'The Gathering for Nation and Morality' and 'The Lithuanian Patriotic Youth' (2012: 36). Banners included slogans such as 'NO to Homopropaganda', 'EU Wants—We Don't' and 'I Am for Healthy Lithuania'. Most blatant was Catholic priest Alfonsas Svarinskas, who spoke and 'stated that homosexuality, Nazism and communism have a lot in common, and invited people to unite against the enemy. He said that "those who are with homosexuals are against the nation!"' (2012: 37). All of these counter-demonstrations were nationalistic performances using gay rights demonstrators to define who and what they are not. In the process, they reinforce who they are as Lithuanians, to themselves and to outsiders.

Conclusion

> The problem may not be a matter of "good nationalisms" or "bad nationalisms," but that enduring inequalities related to race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, class, and religion make inclusionary nationalism virtually impossible. (Puri 2004: 165)

Many theorists envision cosmopolitanism's moral universalism as the logical alternative to nationalism's particularity and exclusionary characteristics, a counter to the tendency of some nationalists to universalise their identity by casting nationalism in essentialist terms. Despite a continuing mistrust of nationalism, however, others assent to some form of it as having the potential for enhancing citizens' quality of life. The work done by these theorists suggests that cosmopolitanism, or at least certain forms of it, may not be fundamentally opposed to nationalism. However, a successful argument for a completely inclusionary nationalism still needs to be made, and I am unconvinced by the softened critiques of those attempting what is in effect a compromise between nationalism or patriotism and cosmopolitanism. I am in agreement with O'Neill's observation that human rights within nations are regularly violated and I have

argued that those violations serve a purpose in supporting national identity through excluding those the nation deems outside rights' coverage, particularly with regard to LGBT and women's rights (O'Neill 2000: 181).

The debate on nationalism is undergirded by the cosmopolitan debate about how to mediate between local attachments and (universalised) principles of justice, between global versus local obligations. It is not the importance of localised attachments that are most problematic for these theorists. Instead, it is in recognising the importance of these attachments that it becomes clear the normative approaches do not sufficiently address the ways that gender, sexual, and racial hierarchies are bound up in the formation of national identity. Attachments form on every level, from the interpersonal to the familial to the community and state, forming identities and exclusions—and it is where norms and particularities are formed. As certain attachments and identities form and result in excluding marginalisations, particularly on the national level, the recognition of these attachments demands acknowledging and valuing difference if we are to resist exclusionary identities. One cannot hold a cosmopolitan position if one believes that some people are more deserving of social justice than others, especially in the context of national discourses.

Thus, the search for inclusionary nationalism is at best constrained, however constructive nationalism can sometimes be. Because it is dependent on nationalist identity forged through exclusionary and oppressive social hierarchies, I have argued, along with Butler and Spivak, that exclusion is always implicit in nation and therefore incompatible with cosmopolitanism. Fine and Beck understand nationalism's problems as beginning with the nation state, as do many anti-nationalists. If national identity and nationalism are inevitable in the nation state global order, cosmopolitan would then be incompatible with that global order. It is a challenging endeavour, but cosmopolitanism would benefit from theorising possible alternatives to the nation state system.

The (often-guarded) assessments of nationalism by most liberal cosmopolitan theorists continue to miss these key issues raised by critical theorists and it is unlikely that the charges of elitism will lessen until they are taken fully into account. This is one of the crucial points where a closer engagement with the feminist, queer, and postcolonial literatures can enhance cosmopolitan theory. The issue here is whether a reconstructed cosmopolitanism—one that accepts certain forms of identity, attachments, loyalties and nationalisms—is possible; one that is not itself reliant on the oppressive exclusions and marginalisations that national identity always requires.

If the original opposition between nationalism and cosmopolitanism has softened, this makes it even more imperative to incorporate a deconstruction of nationalism and its dependence on difference into any and all cosmopolitan theories. We need a fuller understanding of the relationship between cosmopolitanism and nationalism, identity formation and difference, rather than abandoning that terrain entirely. Such a deconstruction by normative theorists may result in finding any kind of nationalism unacceptable to cosmopolitanism. Even Appiah, who advocates a patriotism more simply associated with community and rootedness, recognises the perils of his position. He warns against the desire for a 'common national culture', which he associates with national identity. Nationalism's tendency to 'go imperial' is problematic to those who value difference because it 'dominat[es] not only people of other identities, but the other identities, whose shape is exactly what makes us what we individually and distinctively are (Appiah 1998: 106). Whilst I recognise the general need and desire for rootedness and certain forms of familial or communal attachments (and in this I concur with Appiah), theorists need to be aware of the slippery slope to excluding others, keeping the problem of national identity always in mind.

Chapter Six Overview

Chapter Six marks the conclusion to this thesis. In this chapter, I bring together the results of my analyses of cosmopolitanism's core components and discuss what formulation of each of cosmopolitanism's three components works well for a reconstructed critical cosmopolitanism. I argue that the most constructive way forward for critical cosmopolitanism is incorporating an intersubjective approach to the theory and integrating theories on mutuality and sociality to form a 'cosmopolitan intersubjectivity'. I use the work of Butler, Arendt, Beck, and Cornell to present a feminist, intersubjective, critical cosmopolitan theory that addresses the most serious problems its critics have raised.

Chapter Six: A Feminist, Intersubjective, Critical Cosmopolitan Theory

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. (M.L. King 1963)

Cosmopolitanism has different meanings across disciplines and theorists. Normative cosmopolitan theorists generally subscribe to Pogge's three cosmopolitan tenets: individualism, universality, and generality. These tenets are as close to a definition of what moral cosmopolitan theory is as exists in the normative literature. I have mapped these tenets onto what normative theorists consider to be the key structural concepts for cosmopolitanism—autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism—and argued in each analytic chapter that these components normative theorists identify as structural to the theory are necessary for critical reconstructions of cosmopolitanism as well. 'Troubling' the core normative concepts through the work of critical theorists was the crucial process of determining what problems each concept had in general and in relation to cosmopolitanism, and what the possibilities might be in recuperation for a new, critical cosmopolitan theory.

Whilst I have shown how they are valuable in their own ways, normative and critical perspectives, I take issue with both perspectives. Normative theorists such as Beitz and Pogge consider all three concepts as fundamental to cosmopolitanism, however their liberal conceptualisations remain problematic. Critical theorists such as Rosi Braidotti are less concerned to retain theoretical cohesion and tend to discuss the fallibility or redemptive features of cosmopolitanism by focusing on one, at best two of these components, and then assessing the theory based on discreet critiques (2006; 2013). From a critical perspective, this is understandable. Critical theorists are not defending the entirety of a theory; their value is often in unpacking one problematic aspect of the theory under scrutiny, one position or claim. This is especially easy to do for cosmopolitanism because autonomy and universalism are general and broad concepts that are often the singular focus of critiques. If one determines that universalism is unrecuperable, for example, it theoretically undermines the entire theory without having to look at its other aspects.

Whilst the work of such theorists on these concepts is important to the reformulation of cosmopolitanism, I have explored the critiques as they apply to the focus of each theorist's work,

regardless of their position (or lack of one) on cosmopolitanism. For example, I used Butler and Nedelsky on autonomy and boundaries, although neither developed strong positions on cosmopolitan theory. Zerilli, Anderson, and Arendt have been enormously helpful in reconstructing a cosmopolitan universality, but only Anderson has focused directly on the subject. Others have used cosmopolitanism as an adjective for their primary interest or theory, such as advocating a more cosmopolitan feminist theory (Reilly 2007). I have used several postcolonial and queer theorists to interrogate the principal values of cosmopolitanism, though I have found theorists grounded in feminist and gender theories most useful. As noted in the Introduction and by Phillips, 'a feminist perspective is radically pluralistic' (Phillips 1999b: 56). Queer theory engages with a similar radical pluralism; however, its attention to internationalism has been less than feminist or postcolonial theorists. But the overlaps between queer, feminist, and postcolonial theories, particularly regarding subjectivity and identity, are many. The critiques of autonomy and universality outside of liberalism have been the most productive (within and outside the cosmopolitanism context) and I pay particular attention to work done on those concepts by feminist theorists because of their in-depth critiques of autonomy and universalism. However, it remains that only normative theorists discuss cosmopolitanism in holistic terms by integrating all three components. In examining universalism I have argued that recognising the world's pluralism should be the basis for a cosmopolitan universality (rather than the normative foundation of reason as humanity's primary universalism) because as Arendt believed, surely our pluralism is the most undeniable fact of our human existence. The problem of 'othering', particularly in the context of nationalism, is a political problem and I concur with her that requires a political solution (as well as a psychological one).

Feminist theory's appeal to me also lies with its emphasis on social and political transformation, and the cosmopolitanism I present here is similarly so—political, but certainly social as well. Phillips' observations on feminism's radical pluralism are regarding civil society, a not-unrelated subject because cosmopolitanism is as much about a personal position towards others/difference in any context as it is a political theory. Feminist theory generally rejects the contemporary liberal version of individualism as based on a mythical interpretation of autonomy. For many critical theorists, the notion of the stable subject is also rejected on similar grounds. They prefer instead to interpret the subject as non-unitary: intersubjective, constituted by and through others. The concept of the unstable subject is common throughout critical discourses such as postcolonial understandings of subjectivity and identity, and is particularly harmonious with feminist theory's concerns for integrating an ethic of care with an ethic of justice, though again

the overlaps are extensive. I have taken up theorists such as Puri who clearly incorporate both feminist and postcolonial perspectives. Normative ethics of justice are generally beholden to the ideas of stable subjectivity and non-relational autonomy, whilst ethics of care can accommodate the multiplicities of identity and subjectivity. Cosmopolitan theorists have prioritized identity and difference as they pertain to ethnicity and multiculturalism, but they do not intersect nation, gender, and heteronormativity with their affective power vectors as comprehensively as either feminist or, to a lesser degree, postcolonial critical theory have done (Ong 1999: 1, 13-16; Stoler 1995). Nevertheless, theorists from all three perspectives (feminist, postcolonial, queer) have proven useful in interrogating these broad philosophical concepts.

I suggest that feminist theory's emphasis on reflexivity would be highly useful to cosmopolitan theory. Narayan advocates a continuous, feminist methodological approach to understanding complex structures of oppression in different cultural and temporal spheres while resisting analogizing results with Western experiences (Narayan 1997: 174, 178). The incommensurability of experience demands a different kind of respect for difference. Despite cosmopolitanism's concern for difference, diversity, and equality, this is exactly where some of cosmopolitanism's problems with hegemonic universalisms lie. Although her suggestion is nearly twenty years old, reflexivity is a relatively new concept to cosmopolitan theory, and Narayan's advice would serve the theory well in the process of thinking through some of these conceptual problems.

However, whilst cosmopolitanism's egalitarian guiding principles of inclusion, equality, agency, and respect are principles that also ground much of feminist theory, it is understandable why many feminist theorists such as Braidotti and Butler are hesitant to subscribe to cosmopolitanism, given its problems with autonomy and universality. This appears to be changing with theorists such as Niamh Reilly, who advocates a specifically cosmopolitan feminism (2007). Liberal notions too often fail feminism's 'check out the consequences for sexual equality' litmus test (Phillips 1999b: 61). Some see it as less an emancipatory theory than perhaps it once was—in the West today, it has even been used as the foundation for a global corporatism that seeks to give corporations similar or the same rights as people (see *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*[56]). It is more surprising that few normative cosmopolitan theorists have found sympathy and commonality with feminist theory's highly cosmopolitan notions of social transformation, distributive justice, anti-racism, anti-corporatism, social and

[56] http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/citizens-united-v-federal-election-commission/

personal interdependencies, equality, global justice, and nonviolence (Reilly 2007: 181-182). I argue with Reilly that cosmopolitan theory needs feminist theory because more than any other, it bolsters cosmopolitan concerns and because it needs to integrate the issues that feminist theory addresses, including the intersectionalities of different forms of oppression (2007: 181, 187-189).

Because critical theorists have done interesting and valuable work in the key areas noted, and I contend that such work needs to be integrated into normative moral and political philosophies, my reconstructed critical cosmopolitan theory is a step in that direction. I understand why its general underspecification is valued by Robbins and other theorists (Pollock, Bhabha et al. 2000: 584; Robbins 1998a: 1-4). However, as more and more work is done in the field, perhaps it is time to flesh out what we think cosmopolitanism is, both critical and normative, not just in one or two areas but also in the three key areas that are the three most crucial to the theory.

Cosmopolitan intersubjectivity

In this chapter I pull together the best reformulations for cosmopolitanism from the analytic chapters, and argue that these concepts, whilst theoretically separate, should be integrated in order to be most compatible with cosmopolitanism's basic ideals. The approach I take is intersubjective, which ties autonomy, universalism, and anti-nationalism together through notions of the unstable subject, the deconstruction of identity, and transgressing boundaries that are at once physical, geographical, national, and psychic. Subjects are constituted by and through each other, and mutuality reveals levels of interdependence not often recognised by liberal theorists. It is not simply a matter of relationality, which is important and something that many normative theorists recognise to a greater or lesser degree, and there is a conceptual link between relationality and intersubjectivity. But the idea that we are subjects of each other, yet with autonomy, is not as easy to grasp, especially from a liberal perspective. Butler's and Beck's (see below and Chapter Five) work on boundaries are perhaps the most useful, as is Cornell's work on community, the individual, and Ubuntu. I call this perspective *cosmopolitan intersubjectivity*.

Butler has heavily theorised the commonality and intersubjectivity of boundaries, clearly linking the personal and interpersonal levels to the national and international levels, and similar in content to Beck's thoughts on boundaries and borders (see below). This, too, is a cosmopolitan approach, although unlike Beck she does not name it as such. Her framing is an ontological one, and often foregrounds loss. She asks, 'Who am I, such that certain losses would seem to threaten

me with my own survival? Am I bound to others in ways that make my own survival alternately thinkable or unthinkable?' (2008: 12:50). The framing of loss and grief is a logical one for her. Butler has a keen interest in the politics of what makes a grievable life, partly because of her concern for the systemic objectifications and dehumanisations of certain 'sides' in dichotomous conflicts: Iraqi/American, Israeli/Palestinian, homosexuals with AIDS/others with AIDS. When she asks if we are bound to others in ways that make us think their loss threatens our very existence, it surprises us with its psychosocial aspect: yes, we are sometimes bound to others in ways that losing them—our loss—is so unthinkable that we cannot imagine existing—as we are—without them. One might think of identity here with loss as the kind of formation-producing exclusion. We see ourselves become something else, however slightly. We are changed when the part of the self that was someone else is no longer there. This constituting of the self, the process of being simultaneously bound and unbound up and with others, Butler points out, is continuous. One must have boundaries if they are to be transgressed, blurred, changed, and rebounded in order to become who we are, 'a set of relations without which there is no self' (2008: 13:00).

This process occurs on all levels of sociality: through nations, communities, and at the level of the individual. That understanding, coupled with Beck's theorisations on methodological nationalism, methodological cosmopolitanism, and borders and boundaries, forms cosmopolitan intersubjectivity, which is key to the feminist, intersubjective, critical cosmopolitanism I propose here.

Pogge's three tenets

Before moving on to the reformulated concepts, it is worth reviewing Pogge's tenets at this point, as they served as the starting point for this project:

> First, *individualism*: the ultimate units of concern are *human beings*, or *persons*—rather than, say, family lines, tribes, ethnic, cultural, or religious communities, nations, or states. The latter may be units of concern only indirectly, in virtue of their individual members or citizens. Second, *universality*: the status of ultimate unit of concern attaches to every living human being equally—not merely to some subset, such as men, aristocrats, Aryans, whites, or Muslims. Third, *generality*: this special status has global force. Persons are ultimate units of concern —not only for their compatriots, fellow religionists, or suchlike. (2002: 169)

One of the major reasons for focusing on autonomy, universalism, and nationalism so important to cosmopolitan theory is the ease with which they map onto Pogge's three tenets. Cosmopolitan theory's major concern is global justice and the notion that our obligations to others are not

reduced or eliminated by geography, nationality, or identity, which Pogge's tenets cover well. First, his *individualism* reflects individual autonomy in a general sense, although 'the autonomous subject' may be more accurate. It is in this area that Western individualism comes under fire for the common conflation with autonomy. I argue for redefining individualism in less atomistic terms by rejecting the liberal, egoistic version and integrating the more intersubjective, socialised concept of the individual in its place. Second, Pogge's *universality* is of course the universality discussed by both critical and normative theorists in the context of cosmopolitanism's global justice, especially regarding human rights. Cosmopolitan-type universalisms emerging from the West have frequently been the subject of critiques framing liberal universality less as truly universal and more as a vehicle for moral and cultural hegemony, whilst critical theorists (and the odd normative theorist, such as Barry) propose different ways universality can be contingent. Third, his *generality* gives force to universality and is a direct challenge to national sovereignty in the context of global justice, human rights again being a key concern for most cosmopolitan theorists (1992: 48-49). As such, this third tenet applies to cosmopolitanism's anti-nationalist position. However, in normative cosmopolitanism, nationalism is rarely deconstructed in order to ascertain its marginalising foundations, which I have strongly argued is necessary if a new cosmopolitanism is to end nationalism's marginalising tendencies rather that repeat them.

The point of departure in rethinking these components is in the reformulations of the first two, and in understanding the foundations and importance of the third. If the cosmopolitan position entails similar or the same duties and obligations to all people regardless of geography, identity, or nationality, then these components are necessary. First, rights come down to the *individual*. As I argued in Chapter Three, it is the individual who needs the right to exit, who might be the minority within the minority (and consequently who may be only partially protected by group rights or may in fact be oppressed by them, as would be the case for homosexuals in homophobic cultures), who has a right to an education, or not to starve. Even where education and sustenance are covered by group rights, their varying results are always reduced down to the individual. For those reasons, despite the risks we run of reifying differences that divide us in harmful ways by having rights-based polities (Brown 2000), it is the individual who is Pogge's 'ultimate unit of moral concern' (Pogge 2002: 169). So it is necessary to acknowledge some form of the autonomous individual, and I have argued that there is room for reformulation as I negotiate the complex relationship between the individual and the social. Second, *universality* is necessary for rights to offer any coverage. If global justice does not apply to all, if there are

exceptions to who is 'human' or who has basic rights, then justice is not global; it does not apply to everyone, and thus it is not cosmopolitan. There are several forms of universalism, but without some kind of it, there can be no conceptualising global justice in the first place. The challenge has been in formulating cosmopolitan universals that are not hegemonic, enable us to continue to negotiate the particular, and retain their efficacy. Third, the *generality* of cosmopolitanism problematises nationalism and is perhaps the most hotly debated subject in recent cosmopolitan discourses. Although both advocates and critics of nationalism acknowledge that it can be a unifying and efficient ideology (Miller 2007: 536; Mosse 1985: 9; Puri 2004: 5), I have argued that any version of patriotism or nationalism put forth thus far minimises the risk of marginalising populations within and outside the nation state. National identity is intrinsic to the nation state, and it is national identity that is always and immediately based on exclusivity, which is antithetical to a cosmopolitan position. Both patriotism and nationalism are contrary to cosmopolitanism because where familial, and some forms of communal affinities may enhance the cosmopolitan perspective and strengthen social ties, patriotism and nationalism work at odds with egalitarian global justice. Their exclusivity remains, and they reinforce rather than challenge national sovereignty.

In the next sections, I summarise the key points in the previous chapters on autonomy, universality, and (anti-)nationalism and determine their possible reformulations and what each would look like in order to be integrated into this reconstructed critical cosmopolitanism. These reformulated components come together to form cosmopolitan intersubjectivity. In this sense, autonomy and universality come together easily for cosmopolitanism, but cosmopolitan intersubjectivity has similarly strong implications for its anti-nationalism position. Normative theorists have used the autonomous, rational individual as the basis for structuring universalisms for human beings, particularly around human rights, positing that this model of the autonomous individual is universal, and global justice should be based on that model. It is the Western, individualistic conception of the autonomous individual on which universalisms are based, such as what constitutes a human being worthy of basic human rights. The ideas of interdependency and mutuality are part of the rethinking of cosmopolitan autonomy and universality, but they also pertain directly to the othering that results from national identity. In Martin Luther King, Jr's quote at the start of this chapter, he paraphrases Kant's caution that a violation of rights somewhere is effectively a violation of rights everywhere (Kant and Reiss 1977: 107-108). King goes a bit further, naming and expanding to 'mutuality' the interdependency that Kant implies. Both intended to emphasise that as human beings, we have an interdependent, if unspecified,

degree of influence on each other, and that this influence is not merely local or national, but global. These two quotes by the philosopher and the statesman concerned with peace indicate that there are globalised perceptions of interdependency that may serve to answer the question of why we should care about people half a world away from us as we do our fellow citizens. Kant's vague assertion and King's 'mutuality' leave the door open as to what this mutuality and interdependence might entail.

I argue here that the more poststructuralist account of the subject as fragmented and unstable, constituted in and through our connection with others, may help us construct an understanding of relationships that works for cosmopolitanism consistently on all levels. This approach may be key to resolving some of the problems associated with nationalism, and it does so by abandoning the model of the individual as abstract and atomised, and rethinking how we perceive others in relation to us. As such, this thesis is not yet another attempt to position the cosmopolitan as rootless, at home (anywhere) in the world. Few people are able to be truly comfortable anywhere in the world, and if those people do exist, it is precisely because of their past, situated experiences. One cannot take a 'global' position anymore than one can have a god'-eye view of anything (Haraway 1991: 189). But one can try to account for the global in what one says and does, and that is a cosmopolitan position.

Autonomy

Generally, autonomy can refer to the individual, to group rights, or to the sovereignty of the nation state. It is hotly debated but is generally understood at its simplest as being independent of another (person, group, or state) and having some degree of self-determination. In Chapters Two and Three, I discussed the central problem that most feminists and many other critical theorists have exposed in the liberal conception. The liberal, non-relational approach denies the reality of the fundamental interconnectedness of self and others. Although cosmopolitanism attempts to encompass all people into a single moral community, the emphasis on the individual at the centre is in constant tension with that fundamental interconnectedness. My in-depth analysis of the pertinent interpretations of individual autonomy in Chapter Three came to conclusions that aid in reconstructing an intersubjective version of autonomy that serves the needs of this critical, feminist cosmopolitanism as it relates to the individual.

Autonomy is necessary to cosmopolitan theory for a number of reasons, but one of the most important to cosmopolitanism are that some (agentic) form of it involving self-determination is necessary to exercise the crucial cosmopolitan right to exit, and because it is the individual who

is subject to cosmopolitan/human rights and duties. Contemporary, normative cosmopolitanism is based on liberal notions of the autonomy of the individual, and to many it is autonomy that constitutes the individual. This version presupposes a stable, unified subjectivity, abstract and prediscursive. To Pogge and other liberal theorists, it is individual autonomy that separates people from each other and grants them equal rights in accordance with that equal moral worth.

I claim there must be some recognition for the subject as autonomous in some way from others, if only to exercise crucial rights that others may choose not to. But the mythical liberal understanding of the concept still fails to acknowledge the ways in which we are dependent and interconnected to each other, marginalising women and others in the process because it rings false to empirical experience (Abrams 1998-1998: 822-823; Nedelsky 1989: 9). The core of the myth of the autonomous individual is that one who is autonomous is self-sufficient and in no need of others. Feminists have rejected this version for its failure to recognise that no one is self-made or self-sufficient.[57] Virtually all critical theorists acknowledge the fact that we are all, more or less, dependent on each other. Recognising this interdependence has led to various conceptions of a more relational autonomy, where one's self-determination and independence is understood as in conjunction with others (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000a; Nedelsky 1989).[58]

Given the problems noted by critical theorists with the liberal version of autonomy and the necessity of some form of it that remains for cosmopolitanism, a reconstructed cosmopolitan theory must incorporate some conception of the autonomous individual that Pogge refers to, but a more realistic, relational one at minimum, one that rejects the impossible ideal of self-sufficiency and the fully bounded, atomistic individual. Relational autonomy, which acknowledges that we benefit from growing up, living, and working with others, one in which

[57] In the West, since the founding of the United States, the autonomy of the individual has been linked to the free, unfettered pursuit of financial gain—it is the cornerstone of American individualism and capitalism (Chapter Three). The conflation of autonomy with this Westernised conception of individualism has resulted in a mythical version of autonomy that neglects to account for social constitution and interpersonal dependencies. The model individual in the US is admired for being self-sufficient, 'self-made', and in no need of government interference or benefits.

[58] Not surprisingly, in the US men tend to vote Republican, i.e. for less government 'interference', than women, who tend to vote Democratic. The implication is that women understand the need for help from and protection for each other, whilst men value these individualistic notions of autonomy more highly. Women tend to be particularly aware of these interdependencies because they are by far the more likely to be caregivers, whether of the young, the sick, or the elderly.
http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/voters/gender_gap.php

we recognise the real need we have for others, and how they change us both subtly and dramatically is the baseline, if not ideal (Nedelsky 1989: 31-35).

However, I suggest that the conception of the individual as intersubjective, constituted through and by others, is the most realistic and useful model. Butler's notion of being 'bound-up' with others is a highly cosmopolitan idea, yet unlike Pogge's conception of the individual as simply bounded, with fixed identities and boundaries 'against' others (Nedelsky 1989: 10). Butler's idea that our boundaries are continuously bound-up and *unbound* with each other applies to interpersonal and international borders as well. Hers and other theorists' similar reconceptions break down the false oppositions of discreet self and other, individual and community, us and them, which it seems to me is something cosmopolitan ideals aspire to. Individuals are recognised as such, with individual rights and self-determination, but any community is founded on some kind of mutuality where, more or less, it is as much a part of the individual as the individual is part of the community. That is to say, that mutuality may be greater in some circumstances and societies than in others, but still inextricable. Cosmopolitanism values and embraces difference whilst acknowledging rootedness. But what does this mean? The theory is too often subject to misconceptions of the cosmopolitan 'reflective distance' from one's locale, from charges of rootlessness, from the tendency to abstract the individual and project a transcendence onto the concept that does not exist. Appiah's stranger, the 'other', is never generalized, always particular (Appiah 2006: 98). That is also the experience and position of many critical theorists who refuse to abstract the individual, generalise the 'other' (including women), and understand autonomy as only possible through relations: 'people do not live in isolation, but in social and political relations', and that they develop their identities and predispositions 'in large part out of these relations' (Nedelsky 1989: 21, 31-35).

Perhaps the closest living example of this conceptualisation of the individual and the community as integral to each other is the Southern African concept of Ubuntu, which holds that the one exists *because* the other exists (Chapter Four). The autonomy of the individual is made possible through the community, and the community is made possible through its individual members. It is not a belief system simply made of mutual demands and obligations, and in fact solves O'Neill's problem of rights before obligations: 'It is, after all, obligations, and not rights, that will need enforcing' (O'Neill 2000: 136). They are inextricable and simultaneous for Ubuntu. I quote Cornell at length because she so clearly differentiates Ubuntu and its aspirational qualities from other community-oriented systems such as communitarianism:

> We come into a world obligated to others, and these others are obligated to us, to support us in finding our way to becoming a unique and singular person. Thus it is a profound misunderstanding of Ubuntu to confuse it with UK/US conceptions of communitarianism. It is only through the engagement and support of others that we are able to truly realise our individuality, and rise above our biological distinctiveness… The achievement of singularity is always a project that one is inseparable from the ethical obligations into which one is a participant in one form or another from the beginning of life. We could say that a person is ethically intertwined with others from the very beginning. But this intertwinement does not constitute who we are or who we must become. Instead, we must find a way in which to become a person, singular from all the rest, [in that] singularity they become someone who would define their own ethical responsibilities as they grow into personhood. If a community, then, is committed to individuation and the achievement of a unique destiny for each person, often reflected in the individual's name, but not determined by that name, then the person in turn is obligated to enhance the community that supports him or her… but not simply as an abstract duty correlated with a right, but as a form of participation that allows the community to strive for fidelity to difference and to singularity—what D.A. Masala[unintelligible] has called participatory difference. For Masala, this participatory difference recognises that each one of us is indeed different from all others. But part of this difference is that we're also called to make a difference by contributing to the creation and sustenance of a humane and ethical community. (2009: 32:20)

Ubuntu is a kind of intersubjective understanding of the individual, whilst highly valuing differences that make one an individual.[59] It has cultural particularity—and trappings—that would make it a belief system difficult for someone to adopt if they were not raised with it, and in fact its integration into South Africa society (as it is primarily located in black communities) has not been widespread. But it is perhaps a living example of what an intersubjective perspective on the individual and the community—valuing a kind of individualism and difference along with rootedness and community—might look like, one that is more coherent, and compatible with cosmopolitanism than liberalism's individual as bounded *against* others and society. This does not, however, dictate a closed community in the least. If a person's way of becoming themselves and serving humanity means leaving the community, they are supported in that endeavour. It does not mean the community is closed to 'outside' influences, cultural or otherwise. It does mean that it is people in general who are treated as part of the community, not just those born and/or raised in it. To Ubuntu, the community itself is not closed and fixed, but mutable.

[59] As noted in Chapter Four, South Africa itself is not without its problems of oppressions and violence. Much of this can be attributed to colonial legacies and the long years of apartheid. Deep-seated anger, decades of resistance to the long years of apartheid and the damage done do not disappear with a benevolent statesman even of Mandela's abilities. It is less a reflection of Ubuntu and more the facts of postcoloniality that those problems can be attributed to.

The autonomy most useful to cosmopolitanism, then, would be linked to agency and self-determination; in addition, it would also acknowledge intersubjectivity and how individuals are constituted by and through each other. An intersubjective approach to theorising the individual and community would lead to revealing the interdependence that has always existed in communities. In a sense, that is what makes them communities. Borders and boundaries are necessary to distinguish one place or one person from another, but, as Butler describes, they become simultaneously bound and unbound, borders become fluid with constant crossings and the resulting cultural hybridity in a kind of cultural intersubjectivity (Butler 2008: 13:00). Particularity remains, but not without others.

Universality

Pogge's normative assertion that all people have the same moral worth is linked to but not the same as reason as the universalism that binds humanity. As was pointed out in Chapter Four, many people have lost or never had that capacity. They have the same moral worth as others simply because all are human beings living on the same planet. I suggested there that strictly interpreted, the notion of mutual rights and obligations based on equal moral worth can be problematic. The claim itself quickly leads to the question of who is human, a question that is not simply academic: it regards who is covered under universal principles of justice and in that context so often results in excluding individuals and populations. The debate over equal moral worth and what all people might have in common, however, point to pluralism as that with which we must come to terms. I argue that Arendt's notion of the human condition of plurality as our commonality, one that calls for a politicised, rather social or cultural interpretation of the word presents a better alternative as the basis for cosmopolitan universalism.[60] In commenting on Arendt, Butler says: 'To cohabit the earth is prior to any possible community or nation or neighbourhood. We might choose where to live or who to live by, but we cannot choose with whom to cohabit the earth' (2010: 47:25). Butler sees Arendt's 'principle of pluralisation' (Butler 2010: 52:06) as a possible antidote to nationalism and argues that the crime of genocide

[60] 'Plurality is the condition of human action because we are all the same, that is, human, in such a way that nobody is ever the same as anyone else who ever lived, lives, or will live' (Arendt1998: 8). Plurality is the political fact of difference that we must live with, as there is no viable alternative to accepting that fact. 'Action, the only activity that goes on directly between men without the intermediary of things or matter, corresponds to the human condition of plurality, to the fact men, not Man, live on the earth and inhabit the world. While all aspects of the human condition are somehow related to politics, this plurality is specifically *the* condition—not only the *conditio sine qua non*, but the *conditio per quam*—of all political life' (1998: 7).

‘commits a breakage or rupture in plurality that by definition cannot know nationality, cannot be bound by nationality, and finally, ought not to be’ (2009: Pt 4, 1:25).

The link between moral worth and reason deserves some attention here because grounds normative cosmopolitanism and has been highly influential to critical cosmopolitanism. Cornell points out that for Kant, it is through moral law and the categorical imperative that ‘a human being is of incalculable worth and has dignity precisely because through our practical reason we can potentially exercise our autonomy and lay down a law unto ourselves’ (2010: 4). It is not that we do exercise our autonomy, it is that we can, potentially. Cornell states that Kant does not see ‘autonomy as some kind of truth about how we actually are’, not ‘not a fact of our individuality’, but that our human ‘dignity is inextricably associated with our capacity for reason’ (2010: 4, 12). It is through practical reason that we are autonomous, and in this sense, Kantian autonomy is linked to reason and moral worth, which in turn is what, to normative theorists, binds individuals together as deserving equal human rights.

Cosmopolitanism’s focus on the individual is the basis for global justice’s mutual obligations and rights. If we are all autonomous and equal, we all have the same rights and duties to each other, and that is the cosmopolitan universalism leading to human rights applying to everyone. This is logical to liberal theorists, but if one subscribes to a more interdependent, intersubjective view of the world and the subject, it is only a partial view. We may all have the same moral obligations and rights, but I suggest that it makes more sense to cosmopolitanism if we recognise and appreciate our mutuality, how we influence others and they influence us. King recognised a kind of intersubjectivity, something that goes beyond interdependence, in that ‘inescapable network of mutuality’. But raising that to the level of obligations to others half a world away is a difficult process to grasp, and it raises the spectre of the cosmopolitan notion of ‘transcendence’, where one rises above one’s situatedness to appreciate our commonality.

This transcendence continues to be a problem for cosmopolitan theory, though not an insurmountable one. Andrew Dobson states that whilst ‘embodiedness and embeddedness’ are not alien concepts to cosmopolitanism, they are generally not featured as structural. He notes that Linklater defines cosmopolitanism in ‘dialogic’ terms and that cosmopolitan justice requires ‘dialogue and consent’, which Dobson determines is for ‘thinking beings rather than embodied ones’, as does Mignolo (Dobson 2006: 176; Linklater 1998: 96; Mignolo 2000: 741). Dobson is correct in stating that the normative cosmopolitan conception of justice today is missing a sense of actuality that comes with embodiment—it is a philosophy for people thinking rather than

doing, or even simply being, and contemporary cosmopolitan theory today lacks it as a starting point (Braidotti et al 2013: 3-4).

'Dislocation of the first person perspective' and 'from First World privilege' is the conceptual link that is missing in much of cosmopolitan theory, and the substance of Butler's reflections are very much at the heart of cosmopolitanism—even moral cosmopolitan, if we consider subjectivity—and this interpretation of the relationship between personal/political sovereignty is significant (2008: 17:10, 26:41; see also Chapter Five). It enables the development of a vision of global justice in tandem with a personal vision of the relationship with the other. This is a void that continues to be a problem with cosmopolitanism as theorists try to repair the cold misconception of 'reflective distance' and promote the idea of cosmopolitan obligations to those not our compatriots and whom we will never know personally.

Such a dislocation requires resistance to generalising the other, a problem Phillips refers to Zillah Eisenstein's influence in noting how we should think of plurality:

> We should think rather of a plurality of many differences, so that equality becomes compatible with diversity instead of forcing us into the self-same mould… The argument suggests a very radical pluralism, in which seemingly endless differences by sex, race, age, class, culture… all have to be taken into account… It not a matter of ditching all abstract universals and putting concrete difference in their place. We cannot do without some notion of what human beings have in common; we can and must do without a unitary standard against which they are all judged. (Phillips 1992: 20-21)

This approach works well for resisting hegemony in negotiating universalisms, and it is part and parcel of Zerilli's suggestions on discourse, Hutchings' feminist discourse ethics, and Narayan's emphasis on reflexivity as a crucial tool in resisting the temptation to analogise experiences over time and space. Taking this approach is also compatible with Arendt's claims of the universal condition of pluralism, unlike Hollinger's description as resisting change and preserving the 'old' (Hollinger 2001: 239-240). Hollinger's interpretation of pluralism as conservative is a particularly liberal one, where group rights are preserved, sometimes at the expense of individuals, but in accordance with liberal cultural respect. This cultural respect is often more about ignoring difference than interactive respect. With Arendt's pluralism, interaction is continuous, and negotiation and judgment are politicised. The idea that one could be *wrong* in judgment of another is acknowledged instead of ignored (Zerilli 2012: 20). Pluralism within 'difference' is recognised and the 'other' never generalised.

The approach spans all three key components: it challenges the atomised version of the individual, demands a different approach to cosmopolitan universalisms that take account of situatedness and embodiment, and suggests implications for nationalism's exclusivity. Butler's work on nationalism and subjectivity provides cosmopolitanism a different way of conceptualising 'us' and 'them' on both personal and international levels. Cornell and others integrate a similar understanding of intersubjectivity and take on these challenges by considering Ubuntu's way of conceiving the individual and community in relation to each other.

Nationalism

In Chapter Three I explained how normative cosmopolitan theorists rarely interrogate the foundational problems of nationalism despite the theory's generally anti-nationalist stance, leaving its theorists in danger of perpetuating those same problems. Without such a deconstruction, cosmopolitanism's valuing of difference is compromised and it leaves the link between internal and international othering undertheorised. I argued for retaining cosmopolitanism's anti-nationalist position for this critical (and any) cosmopolitanism, and against attempts to incorporate 'benign' versions of patriotism or nationalism.

Normative cosmopolitanism fails to link how nationalism in internally dependent on exclusions formed by and through national identity. Because nationalism appears to assume national identity, such exclusions are inevitable, and are complicit with the more visible othering of those across borders. The permeability of borders features heavily in cosmopolitan theory because of its focus on nationalism and the nation state, and how these borders affect the obligations we generally feel we have towards our fellow human beings. On personal, geographical, and political levels, these concepts are highly relevant to cosmopolitanism. The very notion of cosmopolitanism evokes transgressing boundaries and broadening horizons. In that sense, the subject of borders also becomes the subject of boundaries: those geographical and political, and importantly, interpersonal. Cosmopolitanism operates on all these levels, and though the underlying premise always directs its discourse, political discussions about geopolitical borders sometimes refer to those borders as models for the interpersonal aspect of cosmopolitanism and boundaries. From that position, I argue, like Butler, that they should also be understood as more than models. They not only represent interpersonal boundaries, but they also are complicit in the sense that upholding one upholds the other. The trajectory of that discourse leads me to cosmopolitan intersubjectivity as a constructive way of understanding the multiple relationships between nations, boundaries, and individuals.

Beck's thinking through borders and boundaries is in the context of the social sciences, but is remarkably in line with Butler's claims. His encouragement for theorists to adopt a 'methodological cosmopolitanism' in place of 'methodological nationalism' is the starting point. That shift in perspective which requires rejecting the nation state system as a given is more than it initially implies, albeit with a methodological framework replacing an ontological one. He notes an epistemological turn:

> [I]t became more widely understood that if the distinctions and boundaries between internal and external, national and international, local and global, ourselves and others grow more confused or hybridized, then the units, issues and basic concepts in each of the social sciences tend to become more contingent. (2004: 132)

He argues that several political and social sciences 'have usually taken certain "units" for granted in their theories and research practices in order then to subject them to systematic study and comparison'. But he asks, what then 'happens if the premises and boundaries defining those units fall apart?' (ibid.).

In abandoning the framework of the nation state and its accompanying nationalism, Beck's new methodology allows for a transgression of previously fixed boundaries, as one would have understood dichotomies such as internal/external, international/national, global/local, and importantly, self and other(s). The 'units' of the social sciences—concepts and issues—become contingent. The lines blur, interdependencies are exposed, hybridization occurs, identities are no longer understood as fixed. Beck claims that the national perspective is falseness because it fails 'to recognize that political, economic and cultural activity… knows no frontiers' (2004: 133). In order to counter that falseness and indeed, to remove said boundaries 'which may in turn trigger a reflex of neo-national closure' a cosmopolitan analytical approach is absolutely required (ibid.). I agree with Beck that without a cosmopolitan perspective, it is difficult to impossible to imagine the relinquishing of such boundaries because a more global (in every sense of the word) methodology must replace the restrictive, narrowing national perspective.

Taking an intersubjective approach to cosmopolitanism is a significant move in that direction, in rethinking relations between nation states as well as between individuals. It contributes to the cohesion of conceptualising the three main concepts by linking boundaries and subjectivity with boundaries and nation/national identity. Beck, as noted above, argues that once methodological nationalism is replaced by methodological cosmopolitanism, the national ontology falls away.

From a social sciences perspective, this insight is valuable in attempts to develop alternatives to the nation state global order.

The deconstruction of national identity makes that national/psychosocial link clearer. When one's identity of any kind is questioned, it is the self that is threatened, and that is one reason why national identity is so successful in upholding nationalism and the power of those who benefit from it. It is a tool, but like any kind of identity, formed through hierarchical exclusions. As Butler explains:

> Identity, however, is not thinkable without the permeable border, just as identity is not thinkable without the possibility of relinquishing boundary. In the one case, one fears invasion, encroachment, and impingement, and makes a territorial claim in the name of self-defense. But in the other case, a boundary is given up or overcome precisely in order to establish a certain connection beyond the claims of territory. (Butler 2008: 19:20)

Such a position resonates with Butler's theorisation elsewhere of being continuously bound and unbound with and to others. It may be the same, not just similar, process between nations when one considers the importance the role of identity plays. Encroaching threats to identity, national or otherwise, are personal. She observes that nationalism is upheld through reproducing a 'certain version of the subject' sustained through the media, and 'that what gives power to such versions of the subject is precisely the way in which they are able to render the subject's own destructiveness, righteous, and its own destructibility unthinkable' (2008: 26:41). Taking Beck's suggestions forward, if we understand boundaries as interpersonal as well as geopolitical, and acknowledge the intersubjective constitution of the individual, the nation state can be conceived less as a given. If we begin to question the 'inevitability' of the nation state global order, it becomes increasingly difficult to conceive of any kind of patriotic or nationalist position as compatible with a cosmopolitan one.

Conclusion

Freedom is indivisible; the chains on any one of my people were the chains on all of them, the chains on all my people were the chains on me. (Mandela 1994: 617)

Civil rights activists from Mandela to King have echoed Kant's words in one form or another: there is a kind of mutuality in the world that links us together, where persecution never occurs in isolation. The more positive context is true as well: no one is 'self-made' when there are families and partners taking care of domestic concerns, and few people could do without the roads that

governments build for everyone. Theorists lag behind activists in this sense, with many normative cosmopolitan theorists still ignoring the importance of mutuality.

My feminist, intersubjective, critical cosmopolitanism is structured by autonomy, univeralism, and anti-nationalism, as I have argued cosmopolitanism in general is. The point of departure is cosmopolitan intersubjectivity. It not only addresses many of the problems autonomy, universalism, and nationalism (and anti-nationalism) ascertained by a variety of theorists, but produces a more coherent cosmopolitanism that is internally consistent with its basic ideals: principles of justice apply to everyone equally, difference is valued whilst rootedness is acknowledged. Using Arendt's universal condition of plurality as a basis for cosmopolitan universalism is compatible with these reformulations because it is empirically true, values difference and allows for particularity in the negotiation of univeralisms. The universalisation of the autonomous individual is replaced by the situated subject. The individual is both separate and not separate from others, and boundaries between nations begin to feel arbitrary.

To imagine cosmopolitanism taking on this intersubjective approach means rethinking all three core concepts outside of Beck's 'methodological nationalism', which works in ontological terms as well when considering the shift in perceiving self and others that Butler describes. It appears to me that cosmopolitan theorists have been searching for ways to frame its ideals regarding difference, 'reflective distance', obligation, and self and the other in a more coherent, internally consistent sense than the liberal conceptualisations allow for. This intersubjective approach is itself cosmopolitan: binaries such as self and other, national and international no longer make sense. Autonomy is still recognised, as is the individual and self-determination. But how that individual is constituted is dependent on a sociality that normative/liberal theorists do not fully recognise. 'Individualism' becomes something else—not absent, but not atomistic either. My argument that universalism may well work through pluralism and politicisation takes on a similarly coherent logic through the lens of intersubjectivity. And finally, cosmopolitanism's anti-nationalist position is the only logical one if the national subject is no longer fixed through the hierarchical modes that currently locate them as 'national subjects'.

Cosmopolitan intersubjectivity frames the individual more closely in relation to others rather than against others, unlike the Western liberal conception of the atomistic individual who needs *protection* from the state and others. We have boundaries, but without losing or loosening those boundaries, we cannot live in those relations; specifically, it is the relinquishment of the boundary 'as a relation to the other' (Butler 2008: 15:10). This is a matter of survival, one that

requires a giving up of defences, and it presents a way of thinking that can be daunting to sustain. Seen in this light, one can also more clearly understand the resistance to cosmopolitanism, except that it *is* the way we live with others. The permeability of these boundaries, interpersonal and geopolitical, is threatening, particularly to Americans (ibid.). But perhaps cosmopolitanism can benefit from the urgency of this insight and the process through which links are made between social responsibility, interdependency, intersubjectivity and justice. This Butlerian view of how we relate to each other can be key to resolving the motivation debate in cosmopolitan theory. How we perceive and understand others as ourselves may get us farther than how, as atomistic individuals, we might logically conclude that we have basically the same obligations to those we do not know as to those we do. It requires a shift in perception that is greater than Beck's urging of social scientists to adopt a methodological cosmopolitanism for a national ontology, but also a shift in how we think about each other—something that has been occurring continuously throughout history. Mica Nava's take on cosmopolitan is the 'everyday ordinary visceral cosmopolitanism' of life in London (Nava 2007: 50, 59). She invokes Richard Sennett, who, in an argument for mutual respect, 'has stressed the importance of the expressive work of acknowledging others and *performing* mutuality in our lives', that it is 'useful in thinking through the conditions for the viable operation of cosmopolitanism'. Performing mutuality is one possible tool for aiding that shift in perception, one that works well with the cosmopolitan intersubjectivity I argue is cosmopolitanism's way forward.

Bibliography

Abrams, Kathrynn. 1998-1999. From Autonomy to Agency: Feminist Perspectives on Self-Direction. *William and Mary Law Review* 40 (805):805-846.

Ackerman, Bruce. 1994. Rooted Cosmopolitanism. *Ethics* 104 (3):516-535.

Agamben, Giorgio. 2006. *Giorgio Agamben on Hannah Arendt's "We Refugees"* [Blog], 2006-04-03 http://roundtable.kein.org/node/399

Alsop, Zoe. 2009. *Uganda's Anti-Gay Bill: Inspired by the U.S.* Time.com, 10/12/09 http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1946645,00.html

Amnesty, International. 1999. Campaigning for Gay and Lesbian Human Rights. *Focus* 29 (5):1-5.

———. 2012. *Uganda: Anti-homosexuality bill a "Grave assault on human rights"*. Amnesty International, 8 February 2012 http://www.amnesty.org.uk/news_details.asp?NewsID=19936

Anderson, Amanda. 1998. Cosmopolitanism, Universalism, and The Divided Legacies of Modernity. In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, edited by P. Cheah and B. Robbins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London; New York: Verso.

Ang, Ien. 2001. I'm A Feminist But… 'Other' Women and Postnational Feminism. In *Feminism and 'Race'*, edited by K.-K. Bhavnani. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 1992. *In My Father's House: Africa in the Philosophy of Culture*. London: Methuen.

———. 1998. Cosmopolitan Patriots. In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, edited by P. Cheah and B. Robbins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2005. *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2006. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in A World of Strangers*. Issues of Our Time. New York: W.W. Norton.

———. 2008. *Anthony Appiah on Cosmopolitanism*. March 2, 2008. Philosophy Bites. Interview (audio): http://nigelwarburton.typepad.com/philosophy_bites/2008/03/anthony-appiah.html

Arendt, Hannah. 1968. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New ed. New York; London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.

———. 1971. “Thinking and Moral Considerations: A Lecture.” *Social Research* no. 38 (3):417–446.

———. 1994. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. Rev. and enl. ed, Penguin Twentieth-Century Classics. New York: Penguin Books. Original edition, 1963.

———. 1998. *The Human Condition*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Original edition, 1958.

Arendt, Hannah, and Jerome Kohn. 2003. *Responsibility and Judgment*. 1st ed. New York: Schocken Books.

Associated_Press. 2004. Texas school district scraps alleged ‘cross-dressing’ day. *Observer-Reporter*, November 17, 2004.

Barclay, Linda. 2000. Autonomy and the Social Self. In *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and the Social Self*, edited by C. Mackenzie and N. Stoljar. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barry, Brian M. 2001. *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Baumann, Holger. 2008. Reconsidering Relational Autonomy. Personal Autonomy for Socially Embedded and Temporally Extended Selves. *Analyse & Kritik* 30:445–468.

BBCNews. 2001. *‘Extremist’ Gay Trial Opens in Egypt*. BBC, 18/07/01 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/1444831.stm

Beardsworth, Richard. 2011. *Cosmopolitanism and International Relations Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, Ulrich. 2003. Toward a New Critical Theory with a Cosmopolitan Intent. *Constellations* 10 (4):453-468.

———. 2004. Cosmopolitical Realism: On the Distinction Between Cosmopolitanism in Philosophy and the Social Sciences. *Global Networks* 4 (2):131-156.

Beck, Ulrich, and Natan Sznaider. 2006. Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda. *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1):1-23.

Beitz, Charles. 1999a. Social and Cosmopolitan Liberalism. *International Affairs* 75 (3):515-529.

———. 1999b. *Political Theory and International Relations*. 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2001. Human Rights as a Common Concern. *The American Political Science Review* 95 (2):269-282.

———. 2005. Cosmopolitanism and Global Justice. *The Journal of Ethics* 9 (1/2):11-27.

Bell, David, and Jon Binnie. 2000. *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Theory and Beyond*. Malden, Mass: Polity Press.

Benhabib, Seyla. 1992b. The Generalized and the Concrete Other: The Kohlberg-Gilligan Controversy and Feminist Theory. In *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*. Oxford: Polity Press.

———. 2002. *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Benhabib, Seyla, Jeremy Waldron, Bonnie Honig, Will Kymlicka, and Robert Post. 2006. *Another Cosmopolitanism*. Berkeley Tanner Lectures. New York: Oxford University Press.

Benhabib, Seyla. 2014. "Defending a Cosmopolitanism Without Illusions. Reply to My Critics." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 17 (6):697-715.

Best, Steven, and Douglas Kellner. 1991. *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations*. New York: Guilford Press.

Binnie, Jon, and Beverley Skeggs. 2004. Cosmopolitan Knowledge and the Production and Consumption of Sexualized Space: Manchester's Gay Village. *The Sociological Review* 52:39-61.

Bloom, William. 1990. *Personal Identity, National Identity and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2006. *Transpositions: On Nomadic Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. "'Becoming-world'." In *After Cosmopolitanism*, edited by Rosi Braidotti, Patrick Hanafin and Bolette Blaagaard, 8-27. Abingdon: Routledge.

Brennan, Timothy. 2003. "Cosmopolitanism and Internationalism." In *Debating Cosmopolitics*, edited by Daniele Archibugi, ix, 310 p. London; New York: Verso.

Brown, Wendy. 2000. Suffering Rights as Paradoxes. *Constellations* 7 (2):230-241.

Brydon, Diana. 2004. Postcolonialism Now: Autonomy, Cosmopolitanism, and Diaspora. *University of Toronto Quarterly* 73 (2):691-706.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge.

———. 1995a. Contingent Foundations. In *Feminist Contentions*, edited by L. Nicholson. New York; London: Routledge.

———. 1995b. For a Careful Reading. In *Feminist Contentions*, edited by L. Nicholson. New York; London: Routledge.

———. 1996. Universality in Culture. In *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, edited by M. C. Nussbaum. Boston: Beacon Press.

———. 1999. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York; London: Routledge.

———. 2000. Restaging the Universal: Hegemony and the Limits of Formalism. In *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*. London: Verso.

———. 2004. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso.

———. 2007. *'I merely belong to them'* [Review]. Nicholas Spice, 10 May 2007 http://www.lrb.co.uk/v29/n09/judith-butler/i-merely-belong-to-them

———. 2008. *Debate La Condición Humana*. Barcelona. February 18, 2008. Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona. Web page (video): http://www.cccb.org/es/arxiu_multimedia?idg=20706

———. 2009. *Hannah Arendt, Ethics and Responsibility*. Barcelona. 2009. Web page (video): http://www.egs.edu/faculty/judith-butler/videos/hannah-arendt-ethics-and-responsibility/

Butler, Judith, and Leticia Sabsay. 2010. *Cosmopolitanism, Peace and Conflict*. Utrecht. The Centre for the Humanities, Utrecht University. Intensive Programme 2010. Web page (video): http://131.211.194.110/site1/Viewer/?peid=87bbe1a0654e4c238d0162ad438f1734

Butler, Judith, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. 2007. *Who Sings the Nation-State?: Language, Politics, Belonging*. London; New York: Seagull Books.

Caney, Simon. 2000. Cosmopolitan Justice and Cultural Diversity. *Global Society* 14 (4):525-551.

———. 2001. International Distributive Justice. *Political Studies* 49:974-997.

———. 2005. *Justice Beyond Borders: A Global Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Castoriadis, Cornelius. 1987. *The Imaginary Institution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity.

Cheah, Pheng. 1998. Introduction Part II: The Cosmopolitical–Today. In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, edited by P. Cheah and B. Robbins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2006a. Cosmopolitanism. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23 (2-3):486-496.

———. 2006b. *Inhuman Conditions: On Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2002. "Recovering Rights": A Crooked Path. In *Globalizing Rights: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures 1999*, edited by M. Gibney. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Cixous, Hélène. 1993. We Who Are Free, Are We Free? In *Freedom and Interpretation: The*

Oxford Amnesty Lectures 1992, edited by B. Johnson. New York: BasicBooks.

Cocks, Joan. 2000. A New Cosmopolitanism? V.S. Naipaul and Edward Said. *Constellations* 7 (1):46-63.

Code, Lorraine. 1991. *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

———. 1993. Taking Subjectivity Into Account. In *Feminist Epistemologies*, edited by L. Alcoff and E. Potter. New York: Routledge.

———. 2000. The Perversion of Autonomy and the Subjection of Women: Discourses of Social Advocacy at Century's End. In *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency and the Social Self*, edited by C. Mackenzie and N. Stoljar. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, Benjamin. 2010. *Human Rights Watch urge Malawian President to intervene in gay marriage case*. PinkNews, 02/04/10 http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2010/04/02/human-rights-watch-urge-malawian-president-to-intervene-in-gay-marriage-case/

Coles, Roberta L. 2002. War and the Contest Over National Identity. *The Sociological Review* 50 (4):586-609.

Copp, David. 2005. International Justice and the Basic Needs Principle. In *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, edited by G. Brock and H. Brighouse. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cornell, Drucilla. 2005. *Drucilla Cornell: Exploring Ubuntu — Tentative Reflections*. Fehe.org http://www.fehe.org/index.php?id=281

———. 2009. *Duke University Feminist Theory Workshop 2009 Keynote*. Raleigh-Durham, NC. Duke University Feminist Theory Workshop. Web page (video): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=51SLGplSnkM

———. 2010. Is There a Difference That Makes a Difference Between Ubuntu and Dignity? *SA Public Law* 25 (2).

Cornell, Drucilla, and Nyoko Muvangua, eds. 2011. *Ubuntu and the Law: African Ideals and Postapartheid Jurisprudence (Just Ideas)*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Darian, Jean C. 1977. Social and Economic Factors in the Rise of Buddhism. *Sociological Analysis* 38 (3):226-238.

Dasgupta, Sudeep, and Judith Butler. 2010. *Cosmopolitanism, Peace and Conflict*. Utrecht. January 25, 2010 - February 12, 2010. Intensive Programme 2010. Web page (video): http://131.211.194.110/site1/Viewer/?peid=01adc462bcc245c98042365302c5cf09

Davydova, Darja. 2012. Baltic Pride 2010: Articulating Sexual Difference and Heteronormative Nationalism in Contemporary Lithuania. *Sextures* 2 (2):32-46.

Derrida, Jacques. 2001. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. London: Routledge.

Dobson, Andrew. 2006. "Thick Cosmopolitanism." *Political Studies* no. 54 (1):165-184.

Dodds, Susan. 2000. Choice and Control in Feminist Bioethics. In *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency and the Social Self*, edited by C. Mackenzie and N. Stoljar. New York: Oxford University Press.

Douzinas, Costas. 2007a. *Human Rights and Empire: The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*. London; New York: Routledge-Cavendish.

———. 2007b. The Many Faces of Humanitarianism. *Parrhesia* (2):1-28.

Enloe, Cynthia H. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. London: Pandora.

Ewing, Katherine. 1991. Can Psychoanalytic Theories Explain the Pakistani Woman? Intrapsychic Autonomy and Interpersonal Engagement in the Extended Family. *Ethos* 19 (2):131-160.

Fabre, Cécile. 2006. *Whose Body is it Anyway?: Justice and the Integrity of the Person*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Faderman, Lillian. 1991. *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers: A History of Lesbian Life in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Faiola, Anthony. 2010. *Gay Iranians increasingly fleeing their country after June's crackdown*. WashingtonPost.com, 04/04/10 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/01/AR2010040101904.html?sid=ST2010021403400

Fine, Robert. 2003. Taking the 'Ism' out of Cosmopolitanism: An Essay in Reconstruction. *European Journal of Social Theory* 6 (4):451-470.

Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of The Prison*. Translated by A. Sheridan. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

———. 1980. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.

Friedman, Marilyn. 1987. Beyond Caring: The De-Moralization of Gender. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* Supplemenatry Vol. 13:87-110.

———. 2000. Autonomy, Social Disruption, and Women. In *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and the Social Self*, edited by C. Mackenzie and N. Stoljar. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2003. *Autonomy, Gender, Politics*. Studies in Feminist Philosophy. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Galston, William A. 1995. Two Concepts of Liberalism. *Ethics* 105 (3):516-534.

Geertz, Clifford. 2000. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. 3rd ed. New York: Basic Books.

Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Gilman, Sander. 1992. Black Bodies, White Bodies: Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in Late Nineteenth Century Art, Medicine, and Literature. In *'Race', Culture and Difference*, edited by J. Donald and A. Rattansi. London: SAGE Publications.

Gilroy, Paul. 2004. *After Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture?* London; New York: Routledge.

Glendon, Mary Ann. 1998. Knowing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. *Notre Dame Law Review* 73 (5):1153-1190.

Hall, Stuart. 1996. Introduction: Who Needs Identity? In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by S. Hall and P. Du Gay. London: Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.

———. 2002. Political Belonging. In *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*, edited by R. Cohen and S. Vertovec. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*, *Comedia*. London: Routledge.

Haraway, Donna. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Re-invention of Nature*. London: Free Association Books, Ltd.

Harris-Lacewell, Melissa. 2010. *'The Rachel Maddow Show' for Thursday, August 5th, 2010* [transcript of live interview]. MSNBC, 6/8/ http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/38593269/ns/msnbc_tv-rachel_maddow_show/

Healthwatch, CBSNews. 2008. *Egypt Imprisons Gay Men For "Debauchery"*. CBS News.com, 09/04/08 http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/04/09/health/main4003288.shtml

Held, David. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 2005. The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism. In *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, edited by G. Brock and H. Brighouse. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hollinger, David A. 1995. *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: BasicBooks.

———. 2001. Not Universalists, Not Pluralists: The New Cosmopolitans Find Their Own Way. *Constellations* 8 (2):236-248.

Human_Rights_Watch. 2005. *Iran: Two More Executions for Homosexual Conduct*. Human Rights Watch, 21/11/05 http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2005/11/21/iran-two-more-executions-homosexual-conduct

Hunter, Nan D. 2006. Identity, Speech and Equality In *Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture*, edited by L. Duggan and N. D. Hunter. New York: Routledge.

Hutchings, Kimberly. 2004. From Morality to Politics and Back Again: Feminist International Ethics and the Civil-Society Argument. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 29 (3):239-263.

Ingram, Attracta. 1994. *A Political Theory of Rights*. Oxford University Press http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/oso/public/content/politicalscience/0198279639/toc.html No password required within LSE campus. Athens password required outside campus.

Jazeel, Tariq. 2011. Spatializing Difference beyond Cosmopolitanism: Rethinking Planetary Futures. *Theory, Culture & Society* 28 (5):75-97.

Kalogeras, Joanne. 2011. *10 Years Into 9/11: A Look At America's Internal Us vs. Them Nationalism*. The New Civil Rights Movement 2011. Available from http://www.thenewcivilrightsmovement.com/10-years-into-911-a-look-at-americas-internal-us-vs-them-nationalism/politics/2011/09/11/26728.

Kant, Immanuel. 1960. *Observations On the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Original edition, 1764.

———. 1977a. Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch. In *Kant's Political Writings*, edited by H. Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Original edition, 1795.

———. 1977b. Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose. In *Kant's Political Writings*, edited by H. Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Original edition, 1784.

Katz, Jonathan. 1976. *Gay American History: Lesbians and Gay Men in the U.S.A.: A Documentary History*. N.Y.: Crowell.

Kennedy, John F. 1963. Inaugural Address: January 20, 1961. *Journal of Public Law* 12 (235):235-238.

Khanna, Ranjana. 2007. Indignity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (2):257-280.

Khanna, Satyam. 2007. *Ahmadinejad denies existence of gays in Iran*. ThinkProgress, September 24, 2007 http://thinkprogress.org/politics/2007/09/24/16472/ahmadinejad-denies-existence-of-gays-in-iran/?mobile=nc

Khayatt, Didi. 2002. Toward a Queer Identity. *Sexualities* 5 (4):487–501.

King, Martin Luther, Jr. 2012. *Letter From Birmingham Jail*. The Martin Luther King, Jr. Research and Education Institute 1963 [cited June 1st 2012]. Available from http://mlk-kpp01.stanford.edu/index.php/resources/article/annotated_letter_from_birmingham/.

Kleingeld, Pauline. 2000. Kantian Patriotism. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 29 (4):313.

Kleingeld, Pauline, and Eric Brown. 2009. Cosmopolitanism *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* Stanford University. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2009/entries/cosmopolitanism/

Kristeva, Julia. 1982. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. European Perspectives. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 1991. *Strangers to Ourselves*. European Perspectives. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, Julia, and Leon S. Roudiez. 1993. *Nations Without Nationalism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Kymlicka, Will. 2002. *Contemporary Political Philosophy*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Langlois, Anthony J. 2007. "Human Rights and Cosmopolitan Liberalism." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 10 (1):29-45.

Lee, Lois. 2009. Interview with Professor Nira Yuval-Davis: After Gender and Nation. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 9 (1):128-138.

Linden, Harry v.d. 1998. "A Kantian Defense of Enterprise Democracy." In *Autonomy and Community: Readings in Contemporary Kantian Social Philosophy*, edited by Jane Kneller and Sidney Axinn, 213-237. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Linklater, Andrew. 1998. *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian Era*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

———. 2002. Cosmopolitan Harm Conventions. In *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*, edited by R. Cohen and S. Vertovec. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lister, Ruth. 2002. Sexual Citizenship. In *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, edited by E. F. Isin and B. S. Turner. London: SAGE Publications.

Locke, John, and Mark Goldie. 1994. *Two Treatises of Government*. 3rd ed. London: Everyman.

Louw, Dirk J. 1998. Ubuntu: An African Assessment of the Religious Other. In *Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy*. Boston, Mass.

Mackenzie, Catriona, and Natalie Stoljar. 2000a. *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and the Social Self*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2000b. Introduction: Autonomy Reconfigured. In *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and the Social Self*, edited by C. Mackenzie and N. Stoljar. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mahdok, Sumi. 2007. Autonomy, Gendered Subordination and Transcultural Dialogue. *Journal of Global Ethics* 3 (3):335-357.

Mahmood, Saba. 2005. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mandela, Nelson. 1994. *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*.

London: Little Brown.

McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge.

McRobbie, Angela. 2006. Vulnerability, Violence and (Cosmopolitan) Ethics: Butler's Precarious Life. *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1):69-86.

McKinnon, Catriona. 2005. "Cosmopolitan Hope." In *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, edited by Gillian Brock and Harry Brighouse, 234-249. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mehta, Pratap Bhanu. 2000. Cosmopolitanism and the Circle of Reason. *Political Theory* 28 (5):619-639.

Meyers, Diana Tietjens. 2000a. "Feminism and Women's Autonomy: The Challenge of Female Genital Cutting." *Metaphilosophy* no. 31 (5):469-491.

———. 2000b. Intersectional Identity and the Authentic Self: Opposites Attract! In *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and the Social Self*, edited by C. Mackenzie and N. Stoljar. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2000. The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism. *Public Culture* 12 (3):721-748.

Miller, David. 1995. *On Nationality*. Oxford Political Theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2000. *Citizenship and National Identity*. Malden, Mass., Oxford: Polity Press.

———. 2006. Nationalism. In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*, edited by J. S. Dryzek, B. Honig and A. Philips: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007. *National Responsibility and Global Justice*. Oxford Political Theory. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Miscevic, Nenad. 2010. Nationalism, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2010 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2010/entries/nationalism/>.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 2003. ""Under Western Eyes" Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28 (2):499-535.

Mosse, George L. 1985. *Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe*. 1st ed. New York: H. Fertig.

Nagel, Joane. 1998. Masculinity and Nationalism: Gender and Sexuality in the Making of Nations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21 (2):242-269.

Narayan, Uma. 1997. "The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives from a Non-western Feminist." In *Gender: Key Concepts in Critical Theory*, edited by Carol C. Gould, 172-

179. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press International. Original edition, 1989.

Nash, Kate. 2003. Cosmopolitan Political Community: Why Does It Feel So Right? *Constellations* 10 (4):507-518.

Nava, Mica. 2007. *Visceral Cosmopolitanism: Gender, Culture and the Normalisation of Difference*. Oxford: Berg.

Neal, Andrew W. 2004. Cutting off the King's head: Foucault's Society Must Be Defended and the Problem of Sovereignty. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 29 (4):373-398.

Nedelsky, Jennifer. 1989. Reconceiving Autonomy: Sources, Thoughts and Possibilities. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 1 (1):7-16.

———. 1990. Law, Boundaries, and the Bounded Self. *Representations* 1 (Special Issue: Law and the Order of Culture):162-189.

———. 1993. Property in Potential Life? A Relational Approach to Choosing Legal Categories. *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence* VI (2):343-366.

———. 1996. Violence Against Women: Challenges to the Liberal State and Relational Feminism. In *Political Order*, edited by I. Shapiro and R. Hardin. New York: New York University Press.

———. 2003. Are Persons Property? Legal Debates About Property and Personality [Book Review]. *Adelaide Law Review* 24 (1):123-131.

Nozick, Robert. 1974. *Anarchy, state, and utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nussbaum, Martha. 1996. Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. In *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, edited by M. C. Nussbaum. Boston: Beacon Press.

———. 1998. *Sex and Social Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2000. *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*. Oxford [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2004. Body of the Nation: Why Women were Mutilated in Gujarat. *Boston Review* 29 (3).

———. 2008. Toward a Globally Sensitive Patriotism. *Daedelus* Summer 2008:78-93.

Okin, Susan Moller, Joshua Cohen, Matthew Howard, and Martha C. Nussbaum. 1999. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

O'Neill, Onora. 2000. *Bounds of Justice*. Cambridge, U.K., New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Culture Logics of Transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Pandya, C.P. 2004. Census Bureau: Gap Between Rich and Poor Has Grown in Last 20 Years. *The New Standard*, 08/17/2004.

Petrelis_Files. 2009. *NGLTF Condemns Gay 'Glued Anus' Deaths in Iraq; Donates to Exile Group*. Michael Petrelis, 22/04/09 http://mpetrelis.blogspot.com/2009/04/ngltf-condemns-gay-glued-anus-deaths-in.html

Phillips, Anne. 1987. Introduction. In *Feminism and Equality*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———. 1992. Universal Pretensions in Political Thought. In *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*, edited by M. Barrett and A. Phillips. Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1999a. *Which Equalities Matter?* Cambridge and Malden, MA: Polity Press and Blackwell.

———. 1999b. "Who Needs Civil Society? A Feminist Perspective." *Dissent* no. 46 (1):56-61.

———. 2007. *Multiculturalism Without Culture*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Pogge, Thomas. 1992. Cosmopolitanism and Sovereignty. *Ethics* 103 (1):48-75.

———. 2001. "Eradicating Systemic Poverty: Brief for a Global Resources Dividend " *Journal of Human Development* no. 2 (1):59-77.

———. 2002. *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Pollock, Sheldon. 2000. Cosmopolitan and Vernacular in History. *Public Culture* 12 (3):591–625.

Pollock, Sheldon, Homi Bhabha, Carol Appadurai Breckenridge, and Dipesh Chakrabarty. 2000. Cosmopolitanisms. *Public Culture* 12 (3):577-589.

Puar, Jasbir K. 2005. On Torture: Abu Ghraib. *Radical History Review* 93:13-38.

Puri, Jyoti. 2004. *Encountering Nationalism*. 21st-century Sociology. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Rabinow, Paul. 1986. Representations Are Social Facts: Modernity and Post-Modernity in Anthropology. In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography: A School of American Research Advanced Seminar*, edited by J. Clifford, G. E. Marcus and S. o. A. R. S. F. N.M.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ramose, Mogobe B. 2003. The Ethics of Ubuntu In *The African Philosophy Reader: A Text with Readings*, edited by P. H. Coetzee and A. P. J. Roux. London: Routledge.

Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

———. 1987. The Idea of an Overlapping Consensus. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 7 (1):1-25.

———. 1999. *The Law of Peoples: With "The Idea of Public Reason Revisited"*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Reilly, Niamh. 2007. "Cosmopolitan Feminism and Human Rights." *Hypatia* 22 (4):180-198.

Richardson, Diane. 1998. Sexuality and Citizenship. *Sociology* 32 (1):83-100.

Robbins, Bruce. 1998a. Introduction Part I: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism. In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, edited by P. Cheah and B. Robbins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 1998b. Comparative Cosmopolitanisms. In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, edited by P. Cheah and B. Robbins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rorty, Richard. 1997. Justice as a Larger Loyalty. *Ethical Perspectives* 4 (2):139-151.

Rossi, Phillip J., S.J. 1998. Public Argument and Social Responsibility. In *Autonomy and Community: Readings in Contemporary Kantian Social Philosophy*, edited by J. Kneller and S. Axinn. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rubin, Gayle S. 1993. Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality. In *The Lesbian & Gay Studies Reader*, edited by H. Abelove, Michele Aina Barale and D. M. Halperin. New York: Routledge.

Saharso, Sawitri. 2000. Female Autonomy and Cultural Imperative: Two Hearts Beating Together. In *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, edited by W. Kymlicka and W. Norman.

———. "Feminist Ethics, Autonomy and the Politics of Multiculturalism." *Feminist Ethics* no. 4 (2):199-215. Said, Edward W. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.

Said, Edward W. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.

Sandel, Michael J. 1996. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scheffler, Samuel. 2001a. *Boundaries and Allegiances: Problems of Justice and Responsibility in Liberal Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2001b. Conceptions of Cosmopolitanism. In *Boundaries and Allegiances: Problems of Justice and Responsibility in Liberal Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2008. Cosmopolitanism, Justice & Institutions. *Daedelus* 137 (3):68-77.

Scott, Joan Wallach. 1996. *Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University.

Sen, Amartya. 1996. Humanity and Citizenship. In *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, edited by M. C. Nussbaum. Boston: Beacon Press.

Skrbis, Zlatko, Gavin Kendall, and Ian Woodward. 2004. Locating Cosmopolitanism: Between

Humanist Ideal and Grounded Social Category. *Theory, Culture & Society* 21 (6):22.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1993. The Politics of Translation. In *Outside In the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge.

Spurlin, William J. 2001. Broadening Postcolonial Studies/Decolonizing Queer Studies: Emerging "Queer Identities" and Cultures in Southern Africa. In *Postcolonial, Queer: Theoretical Intersections*, edited by J. C. Hawley. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Squires, Judith. 1999. *Gender in Political Theory*. Malden, Mass: Polity Press.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Sznaider, Natan. 2007. Hannah Arendt's Jewish Cosmopolitanism: Between the Universal and the Particular. *European Journal of Social Theory* 10 (1):112-122.

Tagore, Rabindranath. 1958. *The Religion of Man: Being the Hibbert Lectures for 1930*. G. Allen & Unwin Ltd.

———. 1985. *The Home and the World*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England , New York, N.Y., U.S.A.: Penguin, Viking Penguin.

Takaki, Ronald T. 1993. *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Talisse, Robert B. 2010. Does Value Pluralism Entail Liberalism? *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 7 (3):303-320.

Taylor, Charles. 1979. *Hegel and Modern Society*. Modern European Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, John. 2002. Interests and Identities in Cosmopolitan Politics. In *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*, edited by R. Cohen and S. Vertovec. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Turner, Bryan S. 2002. Cosmopolitan Virtue, Globalization and Patriotism. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (1-2):45-63.

UNHCR. 2014. UNHCR Global Trends 2013: War's Human Cost. In *UNHCR Global Trends*, edited by UNHCR. Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

U.S. Summary: 2000. 2002. In *United States Census 2000*, edited by U. S. C. Bureau: U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration

Waldron, Jeremy. 1992. Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 25:751-793.

———. 2000. What is Cosmopolitan? *Journal of Political Philosophy* 8 (2):227-243.

Werbner, Pnina. 1999. Global Pathways: Working Class Cosmopolitans and the Creation of Transnational Ethnic Worlds. *Social Anthropology* 7 (1):17-35.

———. 2006. Vernacular Cosmopolitanism. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23 (2-3):496-498.

Wilkinson, Jennifer R. 2003. South African Women and the Ties That Bind. In *The African Philosophy Reader: A Text with Readings*, edited by P. H. Coetzee and A. P. J. Roux. London: Routledge.

Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 1997. *Gender & Nation*. Politics and Culture. London: SAGE Publications.

Zerilli, Linda M.G. 1998. This Universalism Which Is Not One. *Diacritics* 28 (2):3-20.

———. 2009. Toward a Feminist Theory of Judgment. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 34 (2):295-317.